Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/mennonite-quarterly-review_1929-01_3_1

ONE
GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
(510) 649-2500

VOLUME III NUMBER 1

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

JANUARY. 1929

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

JOHN BUNYAN, CHRISTIAN
Paul Erb

EARLY CONDITIONS LEADING TO GENERAL CONFERENCE
John Umble

OUR PEACE POLICY
Orie O. Miller

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF DIELMAN KOLB, 1691-1756
John D. Souder

NEW DATA FOR ONTARIO MENNONITE HISTORY
Harold S. Bender

THE HUTTERIAN BRETHREN, 1528-1928: III
John Horsch

Goshen College
Goshen, Indiana

$1.00 a Year 35 cents a Copy

CALIFORNIA ... SEMINARY
Seminary Knolls
Covina, California

The
Mennonite Quarterly Review

Devoted to Mennonite History, Life, Thought, and Current Affairs
Published by Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana.
Edited by Harold S. Bender, Guy F. Hershberger, John Umble, Ernst Correll, and Edward Yoder

Table of Contents for Volume I, 1927

JANUARY

Editorial

False Patriotism I

The Mennonite Church and Hospital Work

Two Centuries of American Mennonite Literature—A Critical Bibliography I, 1727-1827

Did Menno Simons Practice Baptism by Immersion?

Source Materials for Mennonite History —I. The Strasburg Discipline of 1568

Reviews and Notes

APRIL

Editorial

The Present Mennonite Migration

Endowments for Mennonite Colleges: Some Practical Problems

False Patriotism II

Two Centuries of American Mennonite Literature II, 1828-1867

JULY

Editorial

An Historical Survey of the Position of the Mennonite Church on Non-Resistance I

Pacifism among the Mennonites, Amish Mennonites and Schwenkfelders of Pennsylvania to 1783 I

A Letter from Conrad Grebel to Andreas Castelberger, May 1525

The Mennonite Church and the Education of Her Youth

Source Materials for Mennonite History —II. Two Church Letters of 1817 and 1842

Reviews and Notes: Mennonites in North Carolina

OCTOBER

Editorial

Historical Survey on Non-Resistance II

Pacifism among the Mennonites of Pennsylvania II

Anabaptism in the Tyrol

Two Centuries of American Mennonite Literature III, 1867-1886

Table of Contents for Volume II, 1928

JANUARY

Editorial

Recent Research in the History of the Tyrol-Moravian Anabaptists

Two Centuries of American Mennonite Literature IV. 1887-1904

Remembrance: The First Ten Years of the Gemeente-Dag Movement in Holland

The Value of Family History for Mennonite History: With Illustrations from Nafziger Family Material I

APRIL

Editorial

The Hutterian Brethren, 1528-1928: A Story of Martyrdom and Loyalty I

The Mennonite Attitude and the Modern Peace Movement as Illustrated by the St. Louis Meeting of the World Alliance

John Kephart (1751-1822) Minister of the Doylestown Mennonite Congregation 1806-1822

Early Mennonite Sunday Schools I

Two Centuries of American Mennonite Literature V. 1905-1927

The Value of Family History for Mennonite History II

What about the Outlawry of War: A Review and Discussion

JULY

Editorial

The Hutterian Brethren, 1528-1928, II

Mennonitism in a Latin-American Background

The Value of Family History for Mennonite History III: Johannes Nafziger's Letter

Early Mennonite Sunday Schools II

Two Centuries of American Mennonite Literature VI. 1905-1927

OCTOBER, 1928

Editorial

Nine Letters of Conrad Grebel 1519-1521

The World War as Reflected in British Poetry

The Present Situation of the French-Speaking Mennonites

The Modern Church College and Character-Building

VOLUME III NUMBER 1

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

JANUARY, 1929

HAROLD S. BENDER, *Editor*

Associate Editors

ERNST CORRELL JOHN UMBLE GUY F. HERSHBERGER EDWARD YODER

EDITORIAL 1

JOHN BUNYAN, CHRISTIAN. *Paul Erb* 5

EARLY CONDITIONS LEADING TO GENERAL CONFERENCE. *John Umble* 13

OUR PEACE POLICY. *Orie O. Miller* 26

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF DIELMAN KOLB, 1691-1756. *John D. Souder* 33

NEW SOURCE MATERIAL FOR THE HISTORY OF THE MENNONITES OF ONTARIO. *Harold S. Bender* 42

THE HUTTERIAN BRETHREN, 1828-1928: A STORY OF MARTYRDOM AND LOYALTY, III. *John Horsch* 54

PUBLISHED BY GOSHEN COLLEGE, GOSHEN, INDIANA

Sanford Calvin Yoder, *President*

Editorial and Publication Office, Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana

THE PRICE of the Mennonite Quarterly Review is One Dollar a year, prepaid in American Territory, in Canada, and Mexico. For all other countries add twenty five cents postage. Single copies, thirty-five cents postpaid. Subscriptions should be sent to The Mennonite Quarterly Review, Goshen, Indiana.

Entered as second-class matter February 23, 1927 at the post office at Goshen, Indiana, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

30033

I AM FOR DRINKING WATER OUT of my own cistern; that which God makes mine by the evidence of his Word and Spirit, that I dare make bold with.

—JOHN BUNYAN.

VOLUME III NUMBER 1

The Mennonite Quarterly REVIEW

JANUARY 1929

EDITORIAL

THE TERCENTENARY OF THE BIRTH OF JOHN BUNYAN IN 1928 WAS the occasion of a great deal of speaking and writing in the way of appreciation and assessment of Bunyan's work and career. For Mennonites in particular Bunyan has a peculiar interest, a kinship which becomes increasingly clearer upon deeper acquaintance with his life and writings, especially *Pilgrim's Progress*. John Bunyan was the classic expression of the non-conformist movement in England, which in turn was the fruitage of the earlier Anabaptist movement which had spread thither from the continent, from Holland in particular. Did not even his contemporary enemies malign him as an Anabaptist? But quite aside from any historic connection between Bunyan and the Anabaptists, there is a deep spiritual bond between them. May we go so far as to suggest that Bunyan is the classic literary embodiment of the spirit of the entire Anabaptist phase of the Reformation, that great third party beside Lutheranism and Calvinism. Why not take Luther, Zwingli-Calvin and Bunyan as the great symbolic figures of these three movements? And have not these three great spiritual types characterized the evangelical Protestant Christianity from that time to this?

Paul Erb, Professor of English at Hesston College, sees in John Bunyan the great ideals which characterize modern spiritual Mennonitism. There is the utter abandonment to the conviction of conscience as to the right; there is the abhorrence of compromise; there is the love for enemy and patient non-resistance to evil

and evil men; there is the boundless faith in the Bible as the very Word of God and as the absolute authority for life; there is the tender conscience to sin and the sincere longing for holiness; there is the hunger for and insistence on personal religion with its source in personal conversion; there is the constant endeavor to maintain the Church of Christ pure and undefiled, cleansed of sin and sinners; there is the practice of a ministry out of and for the common people; there is the servant of God working with his own hands to support himself. Rightly does the author entitle his article, "John Bunyan, Christian", for the ideals discussed are but the universal ideals of New Testament Christianity everywhere.

A CREATIVE GENERATION IN MODERN MENNONITE HISTORY IS PASSing, and another generation that knows little of the past is arising. The re-creation of the Mennonite Church which was accomplished in the period from 1880 to 1910 can scarcely be appreciated by the generation which was born at the turn of the century. The creative spiritual forces which were at work expressed themselves in various forms and diverse manners. New and progressive methods of church work, activity, missionary endeavors at home and abroad, literary and educational interests, accompanied by new types of organization, issued finally in a reintegration of the church around General Boards and a General Conference which met for the first time in 1898. But this came through struggle. The new era had its birth pangs. John Umble selects one or two elements in the life of the period just before this new era, and demonstrates in his discussion, "Early Conditions Leading to General Conference", why a general conference was needed and what it was that led leaders of vision to work for it. He has searched the files of the *Herald of Truth* of that period as well as conference minutes, and brings an exhaustive description of the situation in regard to sectional differences on the question of divorce and Sunday Schools. Such work is an indication of what should be done to great interest and profit for the entire range of American Mennonite History.

RELIGIOUS GROUPS AS WELL AS INDIVIDUALS MAY ADOPT TWO ATTItudes to the situations which confront them as the stream of life flows past. They may drift and "muddle through", or they may plan and "think through". Some think that on some questions

Mennonites have done more "muddling through" than "thinking through". As a group, Mennonites are possessed of deep-seated, intense, century-old, basic convictions by which they live. Some of these convictions, though professedly drawn from the New Testament, contrary the life of the world and even the practices of traditional Christianity so sharply that a deep social cleavage has arisen in many cases. The conviction that contraries most deeply the traditional attitudes and the demands of society is that which forbids Mennonites to engage in the use of force in any way, in particular participation in fighting, either personal or national, and which bids them strive for peace with and between all men. The peace principles of the Mennonite Church are four hundred years old, but they have always been so new to the world that they have seldom been understood by the world. Even Mennonites themselves have scarcely "thought through" the full implications of their peace principles. The World War produced a great awakening on this question to both sides. Since then, the Mennonite Church, in particular its Peace Problems Committee, has been attempting to "think through" the entire situation more definitely to the end that there may be a more intelligent facing and mastery of the complex life-situations that face Mennonites in the modern world, both as individuals and as a group. In his address, "Our Peace Policy", the secretary of the Peace Problems Committee, Orie O. Miller, states some of the thinking that the committee has been doing on the question, and briefly formulates the policy according to which it has been working. It is hoped that the publication of this address will not only bring information but may stimulate an increasing number to aid in "thinking through" this and other problems which modern Mennonites must face and intelligently master.

Biography is the heart of history. But how slender is Mennonite biographical literature. Outside of a few scattered references and brief summaries, Christopher Dock alone of the early leaders has been treated, and he was but a layman. A commendable attempt to gather at least the available material on "Fifty Mennonite Leaders" is being made during the present year by the *Gospel Herald* of Scottdale, Pa. Among these sketches is one of Dielman Kolb, minister at Skippack and Salford, 1717-1756, a prominent leader in the early days of the Montgomery-Bucks County district in Eastern Pennsylvania.

It is presented here in full length, while appearing in condensed form in the *Gospel Herald*. The author, John D. Souder, who has been interested in the local history of this region for over forty years, has done his best with the scanty materials at hand. The REVIEW hopes to be able to present further material of this sort.

IN ACCORD WITH ITS ANNOUNCED POLICY OF PUBLISHING ORIGINAL source material for Mennonite history, the REVIEW presents in this issue some hitherto unpublished data regarding the early history of the Mennonites of Ontario. The material will be a welcome addition to the sources in a field which has been very scantily worked. With this presentation a beginning is made in the publication of the considerable amount of source material which has been accumulated in the archive of the Mennonite Historical Society of Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana, during the past few years.

THE THIRD INSTALMENT OF JOHN HORSCH'S VALUABLE HISTORY of the Hutterian Brethren continues the account of the suffering and persecution of the Brotherhood in Moravia and Hungary through its tragic period of decline and destruction. The flight of a remnant from Transylvania to Roumania, then shortly to Russia, and finally in 1874 to the United States and in 1919 to Canada merely sets out in sharper relief the tragedy. The saddest of all is the tragic story of the forced conversion to Catholicism of the congregation at Szobotiste, where it still exists. This instalment completes the history proper. A final instalment in the next issue will treat of the principles and faith of the Hutterian Brotherhood on the basis of the original documents.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

PAUL ERB: Professor of English at Hesston College, Hesston, Kansas.

JOHN UMBLE: Professor of English at Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana.

ORIE O. MILLER: Secretary of the Mennonite Peace Problems Committee, Akron, Pa.

JOHN D. SOUDER: Local Historian, Telford, Pa.

HAROLD S. BENDER: Professor of Church History, Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana.

JOHN HORSCH: Author and Historian, Scottdale, Pa.

JOHN BUNYAN, CHRISTIAN

Paul Erb

The tercentenary of John Bunyan which is just past has been the occasion of a great deal of writing and speaking about this "prince of dreamers". New editions of his works and a number of excellent biographies have come from the press, and there is scarcely a periodical in the literary and religious fields which has not published articles of comment and appreciation. If further words are not altogether superfluous, this article will attempt to point out matters in the life and work of this great man which are of special interest from the Mennonite point-of-view.

Born in 1628, Bunyan came to manhood in the days of the Puritan Commonwealth. As a youth he was irreligious, but through the influence of a godly wife he attempted to make his life respectable according to the strict code of Puritan morals. But when he really came into full deliverance from his life of sin, he joined the little independent church in Bedford which was under the leadership of John Gifford. In this congregation he lived until his death, accepting from his brethren in 1672 the office of minister. Thus he became a part in the same movement of non-conformity to state religion and conscientious adherence to the Scriptures which gave rise to the Anabaptist-Mennonite Church in Switzerland and Holland more than a century earlier. During his life Bunyan was vilified by his enemies as an Anabaptist.

Bunyan was first asked to speak as a lay preacher in Bedford Meeting in 1660. He preached his last sermon a few days before his death in 1688. It will immediately occur to the student of English history that the period of his active ministry thus coincides exactly with the stirring days of the Stuart misrule. When the Puritan government failed in 1660, Charles II was restored to the throne. Under the provisions of the Clarendon Code the new government attempted to enforce absolute religious uniformity upon the country. There was to be no preaching except in the established churches, and to absent oneself from these authorized services was a crime. As a result the prisons of England were filled with thousands of sincere Christians, among which was Bunyan. Corrupt as the state church was, non-conformity was for him the plain will of God. Moreover, how could he refrain

from preaching when God had given him a message? From his conviction he would not budge, and the law was inexorable. Twelve years, therefore, did he live in the gaols of Bedford, writing among many others during this enforced leisure a book which sold 100,000 copies before his death, which has now been translated into 120 foreign tongues, and which remains the greatest classic of the English language, excepting the English Bible alone.

The determination which thrust John Bunyan for so long behind the triple-oak door of Bedford Gaol was not a piece of political stubbornness. He sought no quarrel; the issue was not a political one. The struggle was between human authority and Divine, and Bunyan did not hesitate to declare his allegiance to the higher, no matter what that declaration might mean. "Then," said Sir John Kelynge, "hear your judgment. You must be had back again to prison, and at three months' end, if you do not submit to go to church to hear divine service, and leave your preaching, you must be banished the realm; and if, after such a day shall be appointed as shall be appointed you to be gone, you shall be found in this realm, . . . you must stretch by the neck for it, I tell you plainly."

"I told him," relates Bunyan, "as to this matter I was at a point with him, for if I was out of prison today, I would preach the Gospel again tomorrow, by the help of God."

This was no light-hearted boast. He well knew that the worst threats of the justices might be carried out. In the face of exile or death he saw that he must "pass sentence of death upon everything that can properly be called a thing of this life." He wondered what would become of his wife and his four young children, one of them blind. "But yet, recalling myself, thought I, I must venture you all with God, though it goeth to the quick to leave you. Oh, I saw in this condition I was as a man who is pulling down his house upon the head of his wife and children; yet, thought I, I must do it, I must do it." We see here the same abandon to the course of right as characterized the Anabaptists of the continent.

Worldly wisdom counsels compromise. Even the pious George Herbert, Bunyan's contemporary, would have one

> " . . . . move
> Where it is warmest: leave thy six and seven:
> Pray with the most, for where most pray is heaven."

Froude cannot understand why Bunyan should have been willing to suffer imprisonment when "it might have ended at any time if he would have promised to confine his addresses to a private circle." And Garnet says: "He might have obtained liberty by a trifling submission." Zwingli felt the same way about the Swiss Brethren four hundred years ago, and the uncompromising attitude of Mennonite young men in the army camps during recent years was a puzzle to army officers. But these conscientious prisoners could well have understood why the creator of Mr. Turnaway, who dwelt in the town of Apostasy, could not consider the slightest degree of compromise.

It is of interest to us, also, to observe Bunyan's non-resistant attitude toward those who persecuted him. As a youth, of course, he had belonged to the army of Cromwell, but to his army experiences he seldom refers, except for the fundamental imagery in *The Holy War*. It would be too much to say that Bunyan ever thought or taught that war was wrong, although it is certain that he lost all interest in political endeavor of any kind. But certainly in his personal attitudes toward his enemies he is a splendid exemplar of New Testament non-resistance and love. When he was falsely slandered he wrote: "I find these lies and slanders to me as an ornament. It belongs to my Christian profession to be vilified, slandered, reproached, and reviled; and since all this is nothing else, as my God and my conscience do bear me witness, I rejoice in reproaches for Christ's sake." "When I first went to preach the Word," he says, "the doctors and priests of the country did open wide against me. But I was persuaded of this, not to render railing for railing, but to see how many of their carnal professors I could convince of their miserable estate." It cannot be doubted that in the picture of the trial at Vanity Fair Bunyan has put many a realistic touch from his own experiences before the assizes. Yet the picture is "clearly free from personal vindictiveness. The long imprisonment . . . . might have tempted him to retort upon his persecutors in their own spirit, but he drops no poison in the cup. . . . He sets down naught in malice. . . . No great effort of the imagination is required to see in Lord Hategood's charge to the jury a reflection of the Clarendon Code; yet the spirit of the pilgrim does not allow the pilgrim to linger in the bitterness of controversy; he is to suffer rather than retaliate." He even refrained from exasperating his judges by showing them how little his imprisonment took away his peace of heart. For

once as he was being led away from court he "had much ado to forbear saying to them that I carried the peace of God along with me. But I held my peace, and, blessed be the Lord, went away to prison with God's comfort in my poor soul." His wife, too, has the same spirit, for once, as she was departing from a fruitless attempt to secure from the judges her husband's freedom, her eyes were filled with tears, not of resentment or even of disappointment, but rather of compassionate sorrow, as she said: "What a sad account such poor creatures will have to give at the Coming of the Lord, when they shall there answer for all things whatsoever they have done in the body, whether it be good or whether it be bad."

In a continuation of *Grace Abounding* there is a description of the person and the character of this man which includes the following phrase: "Not seeming to revenge injuries, loving to reconcile differences." This positive character of his peace attitude is evidenced by the fact that he was often called upon the reconcile differences between individuals. His death, in fact, was the result of exposure in a rain-storm while he was on such a mission of reconciliation.

In a recent issue of *The Saturday Review of Literature* Henry Seidel Canby asserts that the English Bible is dying. He explains that our generation no longer considers the Bible the Word of God, his voice speaking to us. "The Word, as our ancestors knew it, has lost its power, speaks no more with final authority even to the most devout, and as a factor in spiritual and esthetic education has become quaint and reminiscent rather than vital and awesome." Tragic if true; and I do not know how true it is. I feel sure that there are more people than Mr. Canby knows for whom the Bible has the same old-time authority. And I am happy to belong to a denominational group which by creed and practice is committed to a belief in the Bible as the literal Word of God. For I know that what the Bible did for John Bunyan it will continue to do for anyone who opens his heart to it.

For John Bunyan was almost a man of one book. And that Book, by God's grace, made him what he was. I do not now refer to the perfectly obvious fact that the study of the English Bible gave Bunyan a style, and made him a prose writer unexcelled. "The style is the man," and apart from the spiritual dynamic of the Bible there would have been no *Pilgrim's Progress*,

for there would have been no awakened and enlightened John Bunyan to write it. In *Grace Abounding* he speaks of the early days of his new experience: "The Bible was precious to me in those days. And now methought I began to look into the Bible with new eyes, and read as I never read before . . . . And, indeed, then I was never out of the Bible." Nor from then on. While in prison he said, "I never had in all my life so great an inlet into the Word of God as now. The Scriptures that I saw nothing in before are made in this place to shine upon me." He became not merely a huckster of texts, but a master of systematic Bible teachings. In his many writings he puts his chief reliance in Scriptural quotations and allusions. As Mr. Valiant-for Truth says: "Let a man have one of these blades, with a hand to wield it, and skill to use it, and he may venture upon an angel with it. He need not fear its holding, if he can but tell how to lay on. Its edges will never blunt. It will cut flesh and bones, and soul and spirit, and all."

Because he knew from the Bible the holiness of God, he knew also the sinfulness of sin. Conviction was to him a very real experience. His pilgrim was not more troubled by the burden on his back than was Bunyan by his load of sin. Finding relief meant a search and a struggle of months. His sin of profanity, of Sunday sports, of dancing, oppressed him mightily, and he left them all to get peace in his soul. "Sin and corruption," he lamented, "would as naturally bubble out of my heart as water would bubble out of a fountain." Among his death-bed sayings is this: "If sin be so dreadful a thing as to wring the heart of the Son of God, how shall a poor wretched sinner be able to bear it?"

Critics from Southey's day to this have seen something fanatical in this sensitiveness to sin. Southey said that "Bunyan never was a vicious man." To this Macaulay agreed, laughing at a conscience which could be hurt by so innocent a thing as bell-ringing. Froude thought "a little comfortable self-conceit would have set him at rest." A recent biographer, speaking of *Grace Abounding,* says "one is inclined to treat it as one might the objective record of a psychopathic case." It is valuable "as a study of a certain type of mental distress". And a Boston religious journal, trying to describe Pilgrim's burden in terms of modern psychology, says, "we build up a defence mechanism and suffer from an inferiority complex because of the conditions that prevail in the subliminal regions of the mind." If poor Bunyan had

only had someone to tell him what was really his trouble! No, Bunyan has few lessons more important for our conscience-hardened age than this, that the human heart is by nature desperately wicked. Our modern philosophers cannot understand the burden for sin, because they have reasoned sin away. As a denomination we do well to keep our consciences in good repair.

Like our own Anabaptist forefathers, Bunyan taught the necessity for a personal experience of conversion. By experience he learned how insufficient was a nominal and legal Christianity. When conviction first came to him, he sought to reform outwardly. "I fell in very eagerly with the religion of the times; to wit, to go to church twice a day, and that, too, with the foremost; and there should very devoutly both say and sing as others did, yet retaining my evil life." He thought he "pleased God as well as any man in England". But, as he said of himself later, "I knew not Christ." "I was proud of my godliness, and indeed I did it all, either to be seen of, or to be well spoken of, by men." Then one day he heard some women talk with joy of the New Birth. This sent him to study the Bible on the way of salvation, and there grew in his soul a great hunger. "I did see such glory in the converted state, that I could not be contented without a share therein." Finally, through the help of Gifford and of Luther's commentary on Galatians he found the truth, and peace. But by this time he had learned what he later wrote in a sermon: "Conversion is not the smooth, easy-going process some men seem to think it." And such doctrine he taught by tongue and pen for thirty years. To many of that corrupt age it was ignorant prating, but it was also the message of God to hungry multitudes.

Our materialistic age, too, needs this message of experiential religion. It is a needed emphasis in Mennonite circles. In this day when psychologists are calling peace "release from the inner suppressions of the soul", and when the Cross is no longer a redeeming but rather a "sublimating" power, we need to follow Bunyan in keeping alive such a vocabulary as will include *converted, saved, born again, filled with the Spirit.* And we need to be old-fashioned enough to use these words without quotation marks, as if they were exotic or obsolete.

Because he taught salvation by grace rather than by good deeds, modernists spurn his message as unethical. Says G. B. Shaw of *Pilgrim's Progress*: "The whole allegory is a consistent attack on morality and respectability without a word that one can remem-

ber against vice and crime." The sufficient answer is Bunyan's own life. From a life scandalously profane he was changed by his own experience so that his neighbors wondered at him. His life became above reproach. All his bitter enemies could find nothing evil to say of him. Once his name was connected with a scandal, but he was completely exonerated. Would Mr. Shaw more effectively check vice and crime through the unreadably vile Restoration dramas which were the delight of Bunyan's persecutors?

The ethical implications of Bunyan's doctrine may be judged also by the discipline which he exercised as a pastor. "In 1671 Richard Deane was 'cut off from and cast out of' the congregation, charged with ungodly living and also with 'defrauding in his calling, selling to severall persons deceitful goodes, to the great scandall of our profession.' John Rush was cast out for being 'drunk after a very beastly and filthy manner, that is above the ordinary rate of drunkerds, for he could not be carried home from the Swan to his owne house without the help of no less than three persons.' Some were disciplined for running into more debt 'than they can satisfie, to the great dishonour of God and scandall of religion.' Sister Landy was admonished for 'countenancing Card-play, and for deceiving the Church with her former seeming repentance,' Sister Maxey for 'disobedience to her parents, to witt, calling her father lier, and for wicked carriages to her mother.' Edward Dent of Gamlinggay lost his membership for being negligent in the 'management of his sister's Imployment . . . . neither did he so honestly and Christianly take care to pay his creditors in due time as he ought.' Mary Ffosket was publicly rebuked 'for receiving and privatly whispering of an horrid scandal (without culler of truth),' and John Stanton for 'abusing his wife and beateing hir often for very light matters.' " Sister Hauthorn is asked by letter to make unfeigned acknowledgement of her unseemly language against Brother Scot and the whole church.

All this shows us that the Anabaptists were first critical of themselves. John Bunyan would no doubt urge our own church in America to continue its rather close supervision of the lives of its members, after the precedent of the Swiss Brethren.

To one in sympathy with Mennonite traditions and practices Bunyan appeals also because he lived the life and spoke the language of the common people. Without a formal education, he

came into his opportunities for service because of his natural abilities and his spiritual qualities. As a friend wrote of him: "This man is not chosen out of an earthly, but out of the heavenly University, the Church of Christ. He hath through grace taken these three heavenly degrees, to wit, union with Christ, the anointing of the Spirit, and experiences of Satan." Of himself he writes: "I do find in most such a spirit of idolatry concerning the learning of this world, and wisdom of the flesh, and God's glory so much stained and diminished thereby; that had I all their aid and assistance at command, I durst not make use of aught thereof . . . . I honor the godly as Christians, but I prefer the Bible before them; and having that still with me, I count myself far better furnished than if I had without it all the libraries of the two Universities. Besides, I am for drinking water out of my own cistern; that which God makes mine by the evidence of his Word and Spirit, that I dare make bold with."

We like him too because he was both a preacher and a laborer. There is evidence that he worked at his trade in connection with his preaching to the end of his life. His last will is signed, "John Bunyan, Brasier". In reply to a court question as to why he "did not content himself with his calling", he answered that he was able to "follow his calling, and preach the Word also".

After his release from prison he was immensely successful as a preacher. At one time in London a crowd of three thousand was present to hear him. Twelve hundred people gathered for a meeting at seven o'clock in the morning. He had many calls to important pastorates in the city, but he consistently refused to consider them. A city merchant offered his son an apprenticeship without the usual premium, but Bunyan replied that God had sent him, not to advance his family, but to preach the gospel. He lived in a house which, according to a nineteenth century estimate, would have rented for $25 or $30 a year. When the Earl of Ailesbury called to offer a place under the government, he refused to receive the Earl or to accept any favors. Unspoiled to the end, he cared not for ease or honor.

I close this appreciation with a quotation from C. Bernard Cockett, present minister of Bunyan Meeting House: "The glory of the Gospel is that it makes somebodies out of nobodies, and John Bunyan is one of history's noblest examples of the redemptive process that releases divine power in the soul of an ordinary man."

EARLY CONDITIONS LEADING TO GENERAL CONFERENCE

John Umble

In these days of complete organization of all phases of denominational activity in the Mennonite Church, it becomes increasingly difficult for young people to understand the conditions and experiences that gave rise to present-day institutions. Considerable study of those conditions is essential to a proper appreciation of the great strides made by the Church during the fourth quarter of the last century. And perhaps none of those experiences is more instructive than those pointing the need of a General Conference.

Although from its inception in January, 1864, the *Herald of Truth* performed a necessary task in helping brethren to learn each other's viewpoint and to understand each other's problems, the need for a general conference became more and more apparent. The widest possible divergence of opinion developed on such questions as Sunday school, public prayer meetings, English preaching, protracted revival efforts, evening meetings, and even on important points of Christian teaching.

An outstanding example of this difference of opinion calling for amicable adjustment or at least for a general meeting for discussion and conference is the disagreement between certain sections in the East and West on two important questions—Sunday school and divorce. These incidents seem worthy of note for two reasons: first, historically, they show the imperative need of a general conference due to chaotic conditions generally, and, second, the latter brings out graphically the historic position of the Mennonite Church on divorce.

In point of time, both of these discussions proceeded simultaneously, but it will be more convenient, in this paper, to consider them separately.

I.

The first official notice of divorce and remarriage seems to be the action of the Amish Conference (General) in May, 1867. This body, following its traditional policy of assisting with advice on specific cases brought to its attention rather than attempting to establish general principles or to lay down rules for the govern-

ment of churches or congregations, appointed a committee to formulate an opinion on the question of receiving into church membership one who had married a divorcee whose former companion in marriage was still living. In a somewhat detailed reply the conference gave an opinion—literally, advice (Rath)—on several phases of the question: (1) It is contrary to the teaching of Christ and his apostles to receive such a person so long as he remains in this state. (2) Such a person is an adulterer. (3) Such person can be received into the church if he shows himself penitent. (4) Repentance in such a case consists in (a) putting away the divorcee as his wife, but yet (b) supplying her with material means of subsistence, and (c) remaining, himself, unmarried. This opinion was unanimously accepted by the conference.[1]

Among both Amish and Mennonites the marriage tie, it seems, always had been considered among the most binding of all earthly obligations. In spite of the fact that shunning was practised with extreme rigor among the Amish at this time, many leaders like John K. Yoder, John P. King, Elias Riehl, and Abner Yoder felt that some exception should be made in case a husband or wife is excommunicated. The Amish Conference, held in Wayne County, Ohio, in 1862, advised that "shunning . . . . . be practised without respect of persons (ohne Ansehung der Person) except in certain cases between husband and wife in which it would do more harm than good."[2] In conference two years later, Peter Blauch cites a case "in which a married man was excommunicated and the ministers were blamed because the wife did not shun her husband, and when they punished her for it and she left her husband, people called her an adultress."[3] In other words, the marriage tie is so binding that, when this wife leaves her husband because she cannot obey the church while she lives with him, public opinion among her fellow church members brands her an adultress.

Following the decision of the Amish conference in the spring of 1867, the *Herald of Truth* in September of that year begins a discussion of divorce. "A brother" asks with reference to Mat-

(All of the titles cited below are to be found in the Mennonite Historical Library of Goshen College.)

1. *Bericht d. Verhandlungen d. sechsten jaehrlichen Zusammenkunft der Amischen Mennoniten-Diener und Bruederschaft,* pp. 5, 7.
2. *Verhandlungen d. Diener-Versammlung . . . . 1862 . . . .* p. 10.
3. *Ibid., 1864,* p. 10.

thew 19:9 (Whoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery), "What is forbidden here? putting away one's wife; or marrying another? or in case of fornication is it permitted to do both?" . . . . In answer to this question, a writer signing himself "K" (probably R. Keagy, Elkhart, Indiana) proposes: "in case she be guilty of fornication and her husband put her away and marry another, he seems not to be guilty of adultery; but yet I do not think it can be shown anywhere in the Bible that it is right for a follower of Christ to put away his wife for any cause whatever, be it fornication or faithlessness in any respect."[4] This question then became a subject of controversy and contrary conference action for several years.

Although the above question might imply a different viewpoint from that expressed by the Amish Conference in 1867, the reply of "K" is certainly not at variance with it. But the decision of the Amish brethren in May and the *Herald*'s interpretation of Matthew 19:9 in September is challenged a few weeks later by the Virginia (Mennonite) Conference held at Weaver's Church, September 27, 1867. In the minutes of this meeting reported to the *Herald* by "Frederick A. Rodes (sic), Harrisonburg, Virginia," occurs the statement: "It was also decided that for the same reason that a man is allowed to put away his wife he is allowed to marry again."[5] In the printed *Proceedings* of the Virginia Conference, this and several other matters are not recorded, but a line of asterisks in the report for 1867 probably indicates this important omission.[6] Such asterisks occur on only two other pages of the *Proceedings*.[7] It is this same conference session that disapproves of Sunday schools, as will be noted below.[8]

Two weeks later, the Indiana Conference held at Yellow Creek, Saturday, October 12, came to an opposite conclusion on divorce and remarriage. This conference discussed the question: "Can a person who has parted from his wife and taken another (the first wife still living) be received as a member into the church?" The answer was: "He cannot be received as a member unless he puts away the second woman."[9]

4. *Herald of Truth,* IV, 9 (September, 1867), p. 139.
5. *Ibid.,* IV, 11 (November, 1867), p. 169.
6. *Proceedings of the Mennonite Conferences in the Valley of Virginia,* p. 15.
7. Pp. 11 and 25.
8. See below, p. 20.
9. *Herald of Truth,* IV, 11 (November, 1867), pp. 168-9.

During the next few months the whole matter seems to have become a question of grave concern to many church leaders. A storm of protest arose over the Virginia resolution. Replying to the "large number of letters making objections to the decision of the Virginia Conference," the editor of the *Herald* writes an editorial on "Marriage and Divorce". He interprets the Virginia resolution to mean "that a man may put away his wife for the cause of fornication (and for this cause only) and after he has put her away for this cause, he will be free to marry another woman." The Indiana Conference, he says, "adopted a conclusion which is in direct opposition to the conclusion of the conference in Virginia. . . They took a different view of the same Scripture, taking also with it the words of our Savior, Mark 10:12, and the words of the apostle Paul, I Cor. 7:10 and Rom. 7:1-3." Without taking sides in the controversy, the editor pleads that the brethren shall discuss the matter candidly and kindly, "by reason and the Bible," so that the general reader may be instructed and the ignorant enlightened. In conclusion he expresses a hope that ministers especially "may take this point into consideration" so that during the "next conferences the subject may be properly decided."[10]

In the same issue of the *Herald*, Joseph Holdeman, Wakarusa, Indiana, makes a contribution to the discussion. A quotation practically summarizes his argument: "If [we are] under the law, we can get divorces, and get married again; but if [we are] under grace it is strictly forbidden, as we all can see if we search the Scriptures."[11] His conclusion plainly is that divorce is impossible for a Christian under any circumstances.

However, so far as available records show, the most significant development in the whole controversy comes in a long article to the *Herald* by Bishop John M. Brenneman, Elida, Ohio. He admits that he proposed the question at the Virginia Conference and asserts that the brethren unanimously adopted the resolution and that he also gave his voice to it. He defends the resolution at great length, quotes Scripture and the opinion of early Church fathers, as well as Menno Simons, appeals to every rule of reason and common sense to show that divorce is justifiable and permitted by the Church and by the Scriptures, and closes his article by citing difference of opinion among the brethren on this point as

10. *Ibid.*, V, 1 (January, 1868), p. 9.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

showing "the necessity of having a general Conference every two or three years in order to consider and decide important points".[12]

Bishop Brenneman's defense of his position is so complete and interesting that a brief summary seems in order. After a long introduction full of tender, humble pleading for the exercise of brotherly love toward him if he is in error, he proceeds—"I must confess that I cannot yet see that the decision of the Virginia Conference is so great an error as some persons seem to think." He begins his defense by quoting Matthew 5:32. This he understands to mean that "if the said cause exists, the man has the privilege to separate, and may do so and marry another, without committing the crime of adultery. The one . . . . is just as much permitted as the other." He quotes Tertullian, Arnobius, and Hieronymus (Jerome) to prove that divorce was recognized among the early Christians. The following quotation from Menno he insists "is plain enough for any one that is willing to understand it: . . . . 'The bond of an undefiled and honorable marriage in Christ's kingdom and government is so sacred and firm, that no man can be permitted to leave his wife nor a woman her husband, and take another, (understand the words rightly, which Christ speaks,) or marry another, for any other cause than for adultery.'" He also quotes from "our old Catechism"—"From this it is clearly to be seen that Christ teaches all Christians that a man (except in case of fornication) is bound to his wife by the bond of matrimony, as long as she lives." And this from the "shorter Catechism"—"Can a lawful marriage, for any cause, be divorced? Answer, No: for the persons united by such a marriage, are so closely bound to each other, that they can, in no wise, separate, except in case of fornication." Bishop Brenneman reasons that sanction of divorce is implied in these statements.

He next argues that a wife "guilty of said transgression" has already broken the marriage bond, and that a husband, in leaving her for this cause, could hardly be said to break it again. "How can such a broken marriage-covenant," he demands, "still bind a man his life time to such an unchaste woman? Would this be an easy yoke and a light burden?"

He bases his final argument on two quotations: first, "Know ye not that he which is joined to a harlot is one body? for two, saith he, shall be one flesh;" and, second, "Know ye not that your body

12. *Ibid.*, V, 2 (February, 1868), pp. 26-8.

is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?" He denies that the Holy Ghost could dwell in a vessel one-half of which is utterly unclean. Returning once more to an argument of common sense, he asks, "If, then, under the law, such a sinner had to be punished with death, why ought a brother under the Gospel, who is a new creature in Christ Jesus, be compelled to remain united and bound to so wicked a woman and not be permitted to separate himself from her?"

He adds in closing that in case of separation for the scriptural cause he thinks it would be more "praiseworthy" if a man would not marry again; but he confidently believes that such a man "has the privilege to marry again, especially if it would be necessary to do so."

But Bishop Brenneman's article seems only to have added fuel to the fierce fires of opposition to divorce for any cause; for, a few months later, his own state conference in session at Nold's Meeting House (Leetonia), in Columbiana County, Ohio, on Friday, May 15, 1868, "unanimously agreed that the gospel gives . . . . . no license to take a writing of divorcement. Neither . . . . . any right in such a case, to marry again."[13] Some thirty bishops, ministers, and deacons from Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Canada were present at this conference.

In the same issue of the *Herald* which prints the proceedings of the 1868 Ohio Conference, R. Keagy, writing from Elkhart, Indiana, forbids not only remarriage, but also divorce.[14] It becomes increasingly evident that sentiment is crystallizing along the line of the Indiana and Ohio resolutions. In an editorial the *Herald* announces that hereafter controversial subjects will be barred from its columns.[15] No doubt the subscription list is beginning to feel the effect of the controversy. At any rate no articles on divorce or remarriage appear in the *Herald* after this date.

But in July, 1868, under the caption, "I beg Pardon," the *Herald* prints a letter from Bishop Brenneman in which he refers to his "awkward article on divorce and marrying again."[16] He protests that the principle which he maintained in that article, he has never yet helped carry out in any case, nor did he ever have any intention of doing so without the counsel and consent of the

13. *Ibid.*, V, 6 (June, 1868), p. 88.
14. "Thoughts on the Laws of Matrimony" in *ibid.*, pp. 91-2.
15. "Controversy" in *ibid.*, p. 89.
16. *Ibid.*, V, 7, p. 106.

brethren. He signs himself, "Your humble, weak, and unworthy brother." It is evident that a general conference, such as Bishop Brenneman advocated, in which this question could have been discussed freely would have spared so able, useful, and consecrated a leader from the humiliation of having his best thought and study on an important matter thus publicly and unceremoniously rejected by his fellow-ministers after it has become a subject of church-wide controversy.

One of the closing chapters of this unfortunate affair, so far as available records show,[17] is written when the annual Indiana (Mennonite) Conference, assembled at Yellow Creek in October, 1868, agreed "to adopt entire the conclusions of the Ohio (Mennonite) Conference of May, 1868, which were published in the June No. of the Herald of Truth."[18] According to John F. Funk, these two conferences meeting in eastern Ohio and in Elkhart County, Indiana, in May and October, respectively, of each year, were in reality semi-annual sessions of practically the same body, but it frequently happened that each would ratify or re-adopt the resolutions of the other. His statement is confirmed by the Indiana conference report printed in the first volume of the *Herald*. At the conclusion of the report it is announced that the "next semi-annual conference" will be held in Ohio in May.[19] Hence the action of the Indiana conference in this October, 1868, session simply means that Ohio and Indiana still stand against any form of separation of man and wife for any reason whatsoever.

In 1870, the Amish Conference reaffirmed its position on divorce in considering what is to be done with a former member, now under the ban, who, while under the ban, has married a divorced woman knowing at the time that he marries her that her first husband is still living. The question is whether he can be received into the church again if his wife's first husband dies. The resolution on the question affirms that such a person is an adulterer and remains so until the first husband of his wife dies. While in this state he cannot be received into church fellowship, but if it can be shown by scriptural testimony (evangelischen Zeugniss) that the first husband of his wife is no longer living he

17. As already stated, all reference to this incident is omitted from the printed proceedings of the Virginia Conference. And for the years following 1867, the minutes of this conference were not printed in the *Herald*.

18. *Herald of Truth*, V, 11 (November, 1868), p. 170.

19. *Ibid.*, I, 11 (November, 1864), p. 72.

may be reinstated as a member, provided he gives evidence of real repentance and a desire to lead a better life.[20] The conference also cites its former action in the Logan County, Ohio, meeting in 1867, mentioned above.

In spite of the fact that the question had now been under consideration for at least five years, it was still causing difficulty and occupying the time of church conferences. In this slow, often contradictory, and frequently quite unsatisfactory way, many great questions of interpretation and policy were decided in the years before the General Conference was at last organized.

II.

As stated above, the question of Sunday schools was another matter on which some of the eastern and western conferences disagreed. Here again much trouble and misunderstanding might have been avoided by a general conference, but it no doubt required just such unfortunate and humiliating experiences to demonstrate the need for such an organization.

At the Ohio (Mennonite) Conference held in Oberholtzer's Meeting House (Midway) in May, 1866, sentiment was strongly opposed to the Sunday school because the leaders felt that it might bring pride into the Church and also that in many denominations it was more of a social than a Bible-teaching organization. Nearly everyone present had spoken against the Sunday school when, finally, Bishop Nicholas Johnson of Fayette County, Pennsylvania, stated that in his district the Church was forced to provide a Sunday school in order to keep the young people from attending those of other denominations and, in consequence, being lost to the Church. For some years prior to this incident the Sunday school in Bishop Johnson's church seems to have been dormant.[21] He seems, therefore, to have been advocating the Sunday school idea in general instead of pleading for his own Sunday school in Fayette County. At all events his plea was so earnest and so reasonable and his tone so conciliatory that every one present said, "Yes, under those circumstances you may have a Sunday school."[22] A strong endorsement of Sunday schools

20. *Bericht d. neunt. jaehr. Diener Versammlung,* pp. 13, 14.
21. See Silas Hertzler's "Early Mennonite Sunday Schools" in *The Mennonite Quarterly Review,* II, 2 (April, 1928), pp. 123-24.
22. Typewritten manuscript of John F. Funk who was present at this conference.

followed.[23] The next annual meeting of this conference, May, 1867, again endorsed Sunday schools.[24]

In addition to Bishop Johnson's Sunday school which had been flourishing for a number of years before the favorable action of the Ohio Conference, another was organized near Washington, Tazewell County, Illinois, about the time that the movement was endorsed by the Ohio Conference in 1866.[25] Two Sunday schools had been organized previously by David Plank in the Amish settlement in the vicinity of West Liberty in Logan and Champaign Counties, Ohio, in 1863 and 1864, respectively.[26] John F. Funk, after a visit to the Tazewell County settlement in the autumn of 1866, writes enthusiastically about the Sunday school there: "It was truly encouraging to my heart, as I sat there and saw the children and young men and young women sitting together there reading the Word of God and receiving instruction, from its precious precepts."[27]

As noted above, however, the Virginia Conference, in the same 1867 session which voted to permit divorce on scriptural grounds, refused to sanction Sunday schools. This was after the second favorable action on the subject by the Ohio Conference. "The subject of Sunday schools was brought up and spoken against," says the report of the Virginia Conference. "It was not thought best that we should send our children to Sunday school in the way Sunday schools are conducted neither in the way we understand that some of our brethren in the West have them. We can have Sunday school in our houses."[28] This action, like that on divorce, is omitted from the *Proceedings* mentioned above.[29]

"The West", however, continued to organize Sunday schools. Less than a year after the Virginia decision, Bishop Brenneman, although he had taken an active part in the Virginia Conference in 1867, invited John F. Funk to come to Elida to organize a Sunday school at the Salem Church. After many delays Funk at last found time to visit Elida and to assist in the organization of a Sunday school in August, 1868.[30] In spite of much local

23. Note 22. See also *Herald of Truth,* III, 6 (June, 1866), p. 50.
24. *Ibid.,* IV, 5 (May, 1867), pp. 88-9.
25. *Ibid.,* IV, 1 (January, 1867), p. 11.
26. *Sonntagsschule Urkunde die Angefangen den 7ten Juni im Jahr 1863.* (David Plank's individual manuscript record book of the first school.)
27. See note 25.
28. *Herald of Truth,* IV, 11 (November, 1867), p. 169.
29. See above, p. 15. See also note 6.
30. *Herald of Truth,* V, 9 (September, 1868), p. 137.

opposition, shown, for instance, in the resignation of the janitor, Henry Sherrick, who refused to be a party to bringing such a worldly institution into the Meeting House, and in the face of many discouraging handicaps such as dearth of teachers making it necessary to ask non-members to teach classes, the school prospered from the beginning.[31] Bishop Brenneman in a long article to the *Herald*, written November 23, 1868, gives a complete account of the order of exercises and speaks in the most glowing terms of the benefits already derived from the Sunday school.[32]

After the official condemnation of Sunday schools by the Virginia Conference, the "West" not only manifested ever-increasing interest in the organization and promotion of Sunday schools, but the Ohio and Indiana Conferences continued to reaffirm their favorable action at nearly every spring and fall session.[33] In October, 1871, the Indiana Conference held at the Yellow Creek Meeting House, Friday, October 13, decided that "Sunday schools were considered as good and beneficial when sustained and carried forward according to the principles of the gospel, and the rules of the Church, and the Testament should be the principal book used in the school."[34]

Even so late as October, 1873, this Conference found it necessary to emphasize its position on Sunday schools. It decided that if "Sunday schools are maintained according to the rules and customs of our church, ... no objections could be raised against them."[35] Frequent reference to Sunday schools in these conference minutes, however, indicates something beside universal approval of the institution. It also proves strong and sustained opposition. The question needed to be settled again and again. Bishop Jacob Wisler in Indiana and Bishop Abraham Rohrer in Ohio, urged on by a strong group of ultra-conservative laymen in their respective congregations waged determined and not wholly ineffective opposition not only against the Sunday school but also against a number of other necessary progressive measures. Wisler, finally, was deprived of his office as bishop in the Elkhart County congregations for his determined and uncompromising

31. Interviews (1928) with Mrs. C. D. Brenneman and Isaac B. Stemen, granddaughter and son-in-law, respectively, of Bishop John M. Brenneman.

igkeit in d. Elkhart Gemeinde . . . . October, 1871. (Small oroadside, 4½x9

33. *Ibid.*, V, 11 (November, 1868), p. 170. See also *Ein Beschluss wegen einer Zwistigkeit in d. Elkhart Gemeinde . . . .* October, 1871. (Small broadside, 4½x9 inches.)

34. *Herald of Truth*, VIII, 11 (November, 1871), p. 169.

35. *Conferenz in Indiana*, p. 3, or *Conference in Indiana*, p. 3. (Four-page pamphlets in German and English, respectively, containing the minutes of the 1873 conference.)

stand.[36] Rohrer joined Wisler later in organizing the "Old Order" Mennonites, taking with him to the new organization all but six families of his Medina County (Ohio) congregation.[37]

The Virginia Conference, on the other hand, reversed its 1867 decision not later than 1869. In the *Proceedings*, the report for that year states that "the subject of Sunday schools was considered and passed. Subject, however, to the decision of the Church." A footnote adds that Sunday schools were "subsequently ratified by the Church."[38]

Available records do not give the date of the first Sunday schools in Virginia; but at least two had been organized in that conference district prior to mid-summer, 1871. An item in the *Herald of Truth* for August, 1871, states that "another Sabbath School" is soon to be organized "at Brenneman's Church."[39] The *Herald* also mentions the organization of a Sunday school at the Bank Church on Sunday, April 30, 1882, with forty "scholars", and six teachers; and one at Weaver's with eighty-four "scholars", fourteen teachers. This may have been, but probably was not, merely a spring reorganization.[40]

It is only just to say that opposition to the Sunday school seems to have disappeared entirely in Virginia many years before it faded in some Indiana and Ohio communities. Some Ohio congregations had no Sunday school until late in the eighties. In English preaching, too, Virginia was in the van. Long after Virginia had practically, if not entirely laid German aside, Indiana Conferences were still being conducted in that language to the great surprise of visiting Virginians. So late as 1890 a Western conference found it necessary to encourage English preaching under certain conditions and circumstances.[41] Even so late as 1897, it was necessary to appoint an assistant moderator for the Preliminary General Conference at Elida, Ohio, as interpreter for the German people present. John F. Funk acted in this capacity. It was also deemed necessary to appoint two German secretaries.[42]

36. *Ein Beschluss wegen einer Zwistigkeit* . . . . . See note 33 (last part).
37. Leonard Kreider's (manuscript) History of the Bethel and Guilford Cong. . . . . (1928).
38. *Proceedings* . . . . . p. 17.
39. *Herald of Truth*, VIII, 8, p. 122.
40. *Ibid.*, XIX, 10 (May 15, 1882), p. 153.
41. *Ibid.*, XXVII, 7 (July 1, 1890), p. 204.
42. *Proceedings of the Mennonite General Conference*, ... p. 37.

III.

Amid such diversity of opinion and practice a general conference seemed an imperative need to the more wide-awake and active workers of the Church. But no doubt this very diversity stood in the way of an earlier organization of that body, now almost universally recognized as essential to the peace and prosperity of the Church. Bishop Brenneman's plea in 1868 is not the first printed reference to the need for a Mennonite General Conference. Even so early as October, 1864, the Indiana (Mennonite) Conference passed a resolution welcoming "Omish" brethren "to unite and join in fellowship" with them. A second resolution considering the advisability of issuing a call for a general conference in order that ministers from all parts of the country "might get together and in a free exchange of views and opinions become more united and more of one mind" was presented and discussed, but no action was taken.[43]

A little over a year later, March, 1866, in an article, "Unity Among the Brethren", written for the *Herald*, John M. Brenneman after calling attention to the many divisions of the Mennonite brotherhood, expresses a wish that "all the so-called Mennonite and Omish brethren" might be "united and joined together in love, working in harmony with each other." Citing the example of the European Mennonites in Dort in 1632, he suggests that American Mennonites should "appoint a general conference, and invite the various branches of the Old Mennonites in the United States and Canada, not excepting the Swiss and Omish brethren . . . . in order to make an effort, by the help of God, to effect a more perfect union and enter into a more intimate relationship with each other".[44]

Certain Amish leaders seem to have regarded the suggestion favorably. At the close of the Amish Conference in May, 1866, following the appearance of Bishop Brenneman's article in March, Bishop Joseph Stuckey of Illinois called the attention of that body to Brenneman's invitation to arrange for a general conference (allgemeine Berathung) "to bring the various branches of Mennonites into a closer union." So far as the records show, however, the conference did not even discuss the suggestion.[45]

43. *Ibid.*, I, 11 (November, 1864), p. 72.
44. *Ibid.*, III, 3 (March, 1866), p. 17.
45. *Bericht der Verhandlungen der fuenf. jaehr. Zusammenkunft . . . . 1866,* p. 13.

A few years later, in 1871, the *Herald* suggests editorially that "a general conference of the ministers and brethren, of the churches throughout the United States and Canada, would be a great benefit to the (Mennonite) church at large."[46] The editor urges this idea again a few months later. After stating that differences between the East and West call for a general conference, he continues: "I believe such a conference would be good—I believe it would be a blessing to the church."[47]

The only official notice of Funk's suggestion seems to have come from the Ohio and Indiana (Mennonite) Conferences. The minutes of the 1872 Indiana (Mennonite) Conference record that "Since a significant difference exists in the customs, regulations, and practises of church discipline and government, the matter of a General Conference, where all or at least most of the churches in the country might be represented, was considered and discussed."[48] A majority of those present approved the step, but no action resulted. A footnote states that the last Ohio Conference considered the same question. No action was taken, but there was considerable favorable discussion. Consensus of opinion among the Mennonite leaders, according to John F. Funk, seemed to be that a call for a general conference would be premature and perhaps worse than useless, until the Amish groups developed a more favorable attitude. Mennonites felt that the Amish brethren entertained some vague fear that if they allowed themselves to be drawn into too close a union with the Mennonites they would be swallowed up and lose their identity. Co-operation in evangelistic, missionary, and educational endeavor finally broke down most of the existing barriers, but it was not until 1898 that enough general interest had been aroused, long-standing antipathies and suspicions brushed aside, and sufficient favorable sentiment created to bring the new much-needed, long-hoped-for organization into being.[49]

46. *Herald of Truth*, VIII, 8 (August, 1871), p. 122.
47. *Ibid.*, 12 (December, 1871), p. 187.
48. *Bericht d. Conferenz gehalten . . . . in Elkhart Co., Ind.*, p. 2 (Four-page pamphlet).
49. See *Proceedings of the Mennonite General Conference Including Discussions Leading to its Orgination* (sic) (Scottdale, 1921) for the final steps leading to the formation and organization of the Mennonite General Conference.

OUR PEACE POLICY*

Orie O. Miller

First of all, Greetings and best wishes to your gathering called in memory of your common and unique experience in obedience to conscience. No doubt after these ten years many of the details connected with that experience have become a bit shadowy and vague. Already the large majority of our public school children of both common and high school age know about the World War only from their reading or as told them by parents. The term "Conscientious Objector", almost anathema then, has become almost meaningless to the masses today. This Reunion through bringing again to your minds afresh these experiences and ideals will do its bit in perpetuating the ideal among those coming after. To me the method you have chosen for observing Armistice Day seems most fit.

Nowhere and at no time since the days of Jesus have there been organized Christian groups who have so consistently and for an equal period of time witnessed to this principle of Non-resistance as have the groups here represented. C. J. Cadoux, English Friend, in one of his recent books, clearly demonstrated that until 300 A. D. the Church officially and most of the disciples individually maintained a non-resistant attitude. However, since Jan. 25, 1525, during a period of over 400 years, Jesus' teachings on Non-resistance have been literally accepted as a part of our Mennonite faith and practice. Individuals among us have differed in interpreting details of the practice and especially so in times of test. But officially our Mennonite bodies have never wavered in the conviction that a professed follower of Jesus cannot use any means but love and goodwill in overcoming evil in all dealings with his fellowman whether friend or enemy; that he cannot have any part in the taking of human life; and that this loyalty to the principles of Jesus comes above all other loyalties and cannot be abrogated by demand from nation, community or state. This conviction has had more to do than any other one thing with the migrations of our people during these four centuries from country to country in almost every generation. From Switzerland to Alsace, then to Holland and then following Penn to Pennsylvania, at the same time other groups from Holland to Prussia, to Russia and then to western Canada and the United States prairies, and

* An address delivered at a Reunion of Conscientious Objectors at Blue Ridge College, New Windsor, Md., Nov. 12, 1928.

each time away from an encroaching national militarism. This has been the Mennonite story. In many respects that of the Friends and the Brethren is similar.

Slowly this Light which our group here holds to be the truth seems to be percolating through and into the minds of other groups and has become accepted by countless individuals outside our three groups, but rash indeed would be the prophet who should hold that our days of test and trial are all history.

But why is it, say some, that this truth has been so slow of acceptance and especially by the other groups in Christendom? And why the seeming failure among others even to grasp our viewpoint as was the case when you met the test at Meade? And the rest of us elsewhere? Has our historic witness (I am referring now especially to Mennonites) been too negative in its emphasis? Have we perhaps failed in an intelligent rounded-out constructive practice of a faith which for this lack has become generally known for its negative features. In our own history we can see reasons why this may have been true in the past. But in any case, our boys came back from the camps this time quite unanimous in the feeling that we ought not again meet the test of a national emergency as they had to unless we can point to a consistent witness against war and militarism in peace time. Beside this most of them also felt our Church body does not exercise her whole responsibility unless she prepares her own members to meet the tests of war better than was done in the last war.

These convictions of our young men had more to do than anything else with the fact that now for the first time there is in existence as one of the standing Committees of our Mennonite General Conference, a Peace Problems Committee. Our present Committee of six, three from Canada and three from the United States, was appointed in 1924 to succeed an Emergency Committee appointed in the early days of the war which acted as liaison between the Church, the government, and the boys in Camp and which functioned until our 1924 General Conference. So in our group at least, whatever active Peace work has been done during this decade or is planned for the time ahead has found much of its inspiration in the convictions so concretely brought back by the boys from camp.

But to appreciate more fully the policies, method, and program of our Mennonite Peace work, a further word covering the background of our position may be in order. We are Non-resistants

rather than pacifists; Biblical objectors rather than conscientious objectors. We have always felt Peace to be a corollary to Christianity and that real lasting, and permanent Peace within and among men comes only through personal allegiance to the Prince of Peace. A Peace program, aside from an all-inclusive Christian program, has seemed to us largely futile in its ultimate and lasting results. If the guarantee of the individual's success in living a life of love and good will free from malice and hatred and their results is a constant dependence on power that comes from above, how can Peace be otherwise guaranteed between groups and nations? Many in all ages and climes have cried Peace, Peace, when there was no peace. Far too much of the present day machinery for Peace, while beautiful to see and ideal in its goals, is built on sandy foundations and cannot stand through the first real storm test. Our people have always been in sympathy with and have encouraged the efforts of the nations to settle their differences by peaceful means, to arbitrate, to outlaw the whole War system, to take any steps that preserve sacred the regard for human life, or that build a Christian patriotism as against a militaristic nationalism. However, a Christian cannot but feel that in today's otherwise commendable efforts toward World Peace, the upheld standards of mutual, multilateral agreements not to war as versus the Biblical standard of going two miles if compelled to go one, or of giving the cloak also when compelled to give the coat, do not go far enough. Are not Christians and Christian bodies most effective in their witness and propaganda who continue to hold high these permanent fundamental standards? At least so it has seemed to our fathers in the past, and so it still largely seems to us today.

Had it not been for the fact stated before that many of our young men came back home from their War experience feeling that they had been ill prepared for the tests they had to meet there and in the witness they gave; or had the other fact not stared us in the face that through our neglect to witness in Peace time we were not only not understood but were woefully misunderstood by those from the government with whom we had to do; or had it not seemed to us that because of the War experience and results, other sister Christian bodies were ripe for fuller light on this Christian principle, then there might not have been any need for a Mennonite Peace Problems Committee. Please understand, however, that this statement is not made to minimize the various

constructive Peace forces in existence today or in the spirit of judging or questioning methods or results of any particular Peace agency. It is made solely to show that what we do have in the way of peace organization and work has come from a sense of the points where we fell short under the War's test and because of special opportunities following the War and not from any change in the fundamentals of our position and attitude.

Our recent Peace work has therefore followed rather closely the Committee's 1924-enunciated three-point program. First of all, the Committee has been concerned in a program of education for Peace among the young people in our own constituency. We find among them a ready acceptance in theory of the Church's position but a general lack of ability in making clear this position to others and a woeful lack of having thought through the implications of our position in practical living and relationships in both peace time and war time. In a search for means to carry forward such education we found an utter lack of literature covering the Church's four centuries of non-resistant faith and practice. Whereas the Friends have a number of books covering their similar experiences of two and one-half centuries and have had able apologists in each generation for their position, with us there was not a single book devoted exclusively to such ends and no apologist who had written for society at large. Our first and probably main efforts these few years have been aimed at building up a remedy for this lack. Some valuable contributions have already been made to this body of Peace literature, notably pamphlets written by John Horsch of Scottdale, Pa., also articles and pamphlets by Wilbur Bender and Guy Hershberger of Goshen, Ind. But most important of all we now have at least a half dozen of our able men thinking and doing some work along these lines. This will bear increasing fruit in the years ahead and is being encouraged by the Committee in every way possible. This work on point one is being supplemented through fostering the organization of Peace Societies in our schools and Colleges. Two of our schools have taken steps to organize thus within the past year and the one is actively at work. Peace oratorical contests within the institutions, representations from the institutions to the government, peace deputations from the schools to local churches in the constituency, discussion forums on pertinent peace topics among the student body, are some of the methods used. These

school Associations cooperate closely with the Central Committee of the Church.

Annual Peace lectures in our larger communities, at least two annual Peace lessons in our Young People's Meetings, occasional articles along special Peace lines in our official Church organs cover the present efforts along lines of point one.

The second part of our three-point program has to do with keeping the Church's position and viewpoint before those departments of our State and national governments that have to do with our relationships as non-resistant citizens. In short, the Committee aims to serve as liaison between our denomination and the government whether in peace time or war. To this end our office aims to keep in touch with pending legislation whether in state, province, or nation that directly or indirectly affects our position. To show by illustration the kind of problems that may come in peace time let me refer to several that have been brought to our attention and in the solution of which we are assisting as we can. First, because of the compulsory public school flag salute law in the state of Delaware, two of the more conservative Mennonite groups there have had to organize and are at the present time carrying on their own private schools. For conscientious reasons the children one by one several years ago failed to comply in the daily exercise of which the flag salute was a part. The eventual result was the expulsion of between 30 and 50 of the children. Friends in Philadelphia and Wilmington are whole-heartedly cooperating in an effort which aims at amending the Delaware law on this point. Another illustration,—sometime ago an appeal reached us from a group of about 25 Russian Mennonite immigrants who had lived in Chicago during the past six years and whose applications for citizenship have been denied, because in answering question 22 on the application forms they were not able to say they were willing to go to war and take life if necessary in defense of the country. Another tendency of the past few years in the outcome of which our Committee and people are most keenly interested is that of compulsory military training in a growing number of high schools and colleges. Our Committee notes with interest and has given support to the efforts to remedy this situation which are being made by the Committee on Militarism in Education.

Annual representations from our Peace Committee at the opening of Congress to our Senators, the chairmen of the Foreign

Relations Committees of both houses, and the President in the form of letters including hoped-for attitudes on such coming measures as, for instance, last year on Naval reduction, International Peace efforts, Nicaragua or whatever, have become an established procedure on our part. Word is also given to our constituency or to the cooperating peace societies from time to time when more specific appeals, protests or requests ought to be made or when they might be most effective. Whenever such is deemed wise or gives promise of more definite results, personal contacts are arranged or attempted.

The third point in the program might be covered by the general term Peace propaganda. Our organization aims to keep in touch with the various Peace organizations that compose the present day Peace movement. The main purpose in this is, of course, the benefits that come to us and ours from the words and work of all others aiming at this common goal of a warless society in which the forces of good will reign supreme. Another aim is that the continuing programs and policies of the other societies may be properly appraised, and evaluated to our own people. Simply because the stated goal is peace gives no guaranty that the methods are either Christian or logical or that they give promise of attaining the goal. Still another purpose lies in the opportunities these contacts give of sharing with them our own program and viewpoint. Most especially are we interested in the steps forward, even if to us often they seem slow and halting, being taken by other Christian groups. Of the larger denominations the Methodists seem just now to take the lead in the tenor of their official pronouncements and in their program to educate for peace. In noting these advances we cannot but rejoice; and shall continue to aim to make available to these others any benefits that our own experience might be to them. To us Mennonites it is also of particular interest and satisfaction to note the steps being taken by our co-religionists in Holland, Germany and Switzerland in getting back to the Church's historical position. Also of much concern has been the persecution and suffering of the Nazarene groups in Jugo-Slavia who, because of their refusal to do military service, have for years been languishing in prisons by the hundreds.

Our Committee's three-point program briefly restated consists first of a more systematic and thorough indoctrination of our own people. This will logically result in a more consistent and in-

telligent witness in all contacts that our people may make and in gradually building up among us a group of Peace specialists who may become able apologists for a practical Biblical Non-resistance. Our second objective is to maintain effective Peace time liaison between our people and our government on points affecting us as non-resistant citizens. This ought also, in case of another war, meet the lack so keenly felt by our Camp boys in the last War, when they found our position so little understood and so much misunderstood. Third, we hope to share with others interested in this same goal of a peaceful Christian social order whatever may be worthwhile in our own history, viewpoint, and experience.

Although having a Peace background of more than four centuries, our organization is young and woefully inexperienced in the technique of programs such as outlined. Beginnings have been made. Our hope and prayer is to build on right foundations, to build as worthily as we can and to entrust the final results to the Prince of Peace.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF DIELMAN KOLB

1691-1756

John D. Souder

Among the many noble characters who lived during the formative period of the Mennonite Church in America, as well as the formative period of the state of Pennsylvania, Dielman Kolb and Heinrich Funck must ever be held in grateful remembrance because of their united efforts in the planting and organization of the infant church in America.

I shall attempt to assemble a fragmentary sketch of the life of Dielman Kolb, whose activities, both spiritual and material, were most apparent in Salford, but extended to Skippack, Franconia, and beyond the border lines of Montgomery County into Bucks County, and who played a major part in organizing infant churches and directing a healthy influx of Swiss, German, and Dutch emigrants to this rich and fertile agricultural section, where the descendants of these pioneer immigrant settlers are found to this day on some of the farms occupied by their lineal ancestors over two hundred years. It is now one hundred and seventy-two years since the subject of this sketch fell asleep, and thus long have the records of his life and labors been exposed to the wasting, scattering power of the ravages of time. Under these circumstances it is not easy to produce a life record worthy of the subject, whose activities and scenes lie entirely in another century, yet the Mennonite meeting so early founded by him, the venerable place with its important associations and hallowed graveyard, deserves more attention and honorable mention than it has hitherto received.

The historical records of Dielman Kolb, Sr., father of immigrant Dielman, give us some interesting information concerning the father of the subject of this sketch. His place of residence was Wolfsheim, in the Palatinate, Germany. He was born about 1648, and died in 1712, aged 64 years. He was buried in Mannheim, in Germany. There were six sons in the family, and four were ministers in the Mennonite Church. The oldest of the six never came to America, but was a minister in the church at Mannheim, Germany, where he died and is buried. Martin, Jacob, Henry, and Johannes Kolb immigrated to Germantown in 1707 and soon after aided in founding the Mennonite congregation at

Skippack, which was for a long time the strongest and most prosperous congregation in America. Martin was ordained minister at Germantown in 1708; Henry was ordained minister later in Skippack. Dielman Kolb, the youngest, came to Salford in 1717 and with him came Gerhart Clemens, Hans Reiff, and Henry Ruth. During 1718 and 1719 numerous other Mennonite families came to his colony, among which was found his trusty friend, Heinrich Funck, who had immigrated a few years earlier. The *Strassburger Family History* contains the following, which we have somewhat revised:

"Dielman Kolb was a Mennonite minister at Mannheim, Germany, where he had charge of a congregation. He there made himself both useful and valuable by receiving and lodging his persecuted brethren of like faith, who fled from Switzerland where the state church was executing relentless persecutions against those defenseless believers, as appears from a letter dated August 27, 1710. Conditions in Germany were also not of the best, and the hardships that were imposed on the brethren there eventually led to his emigration to Pennsylvania, to join his brothers, Martin, Jacob, Henry, and John who had preceded him several years earlier."[1]

Mennonites have the distinction of establishing in Pennsylvania what developed into one of the very first organized churches, when they planted a colony of 85 persons outside Philadelphia and called it Germantown. The steady stream of new immigrants, their first destination invariably the Mennonite settlement at Germantown, pushed their way to Skippack, Salford, Indianfield (now Franconia), into Penn's Manor in Bucks County, Rockhill, Perkasie, Deep Run, and Doylestown, where the first vigorous Mennonite settlements were made. With the settlements came invariably the first log schoolhouse and church. In all these pioneering operations, from the fatherland to the wilds of America, Dielman Kolb and such brethren as Heinrich Funck did much to direct these needy immigrants to a destination where there was some prospect that life might be maintained. In every one of these several settlements mentioned, one or two Kolbs are found.

Personal History

Dielman Kolb, the subject of this sketch, the son of Dielman

1. Ralph Beaver Strassburger, *The Strassburger Family and Allied Families of Pennsylvania*, 1922., p. 394. Taken from the *Kulp Family History*, by D. K. Cassel, Norristown, Pa., 1895. pp. 483 ff.

Kolb, Sr., whose wife was a daughter of Peter Schumacher, was born November 10, 1691, in the afternoon at one o'clock, in the Palatinate, at Wolfsheim. The foregoing was taken from one of the books which he brought with him to this country.[1] The book was printed in 1581 and was in possession of the Kolb family until 1895, when it was sold at a public auction presumably as a worthless Dutch book, and further traces of the same are lost. On the flyleaf, written in his own hand in the German language, were these entries:

"Anno, 1691, the 10th of November, I Dielman Kolb, was born into the world at one o'clock in the afternoon.

"Anno 1714, on St. Jacob's day, in the 23rd year of my age, I was married to my wife, Elizabeth (Schnebli).

"Anno 1717, the 21st of March, we went to Ibersheim, in the Palatinate, on the journey to Pennsylvania, and on August 10th, 1717 arrived safely here in Philadelphia."

On another page in the same book is the following:

"This book belongs to me, Dielman Kolb, and I have received the same from Jacob Schnebli of Mannheim, in the Palatinate, Anno Dom., 1722, at this time dwelling in Salforth township, in the County of Philadelphia, in Pennsylvania."

The name of Andrew Ziegler is also found on the same page, he having married Elizabeth, the only daughter of Dielman and Elizabeth Schnebli Kolb.

Dielman Kolb was an extensive landholder and bought six tracts at different dates. James Y. Heckler, who in 1888 made an exhaustive search of all the old homesteads in Salford, says in his *History of Lower Salford*[2]: "Of his first purchase in Salford we have no exact date, but the second tract was bought from Dirk Johnson January 4th, 1721. On May 7, 1767, Dielman Kolb sold 50 acres from his extensive tract to his son-in-law Andrew Ziegler. It appears after selling those 50 acres, he still had left 559 acres. Dielman Kolb who held this vast tract of land was a man of means and also was most active in bringing into the neighborhood brethren from the old country, augmenting his settlement and church in untold valuable assets. In 1728 the great road from Goshenhoppen to Skippack was laid out through his land. A mile stone dated 1739 is still standing there to this day."

1. D. K. Cassel, *Kulp Family History*, pp. 483 ff.
2 James Y. Heckler, *History of Lower Salford Township, Montgomery County, Pa.*, 1888. pp. 117, 127 and passim.

Ground Acquired and Church Organized in 1738

In his research of old landmarks, Heckler says in part[1]: "At Salford, ground was acquired on the Fourth of October 1738. On this date Henry Ruth and his wife Madlena, of Salford by deed of lease and release, granted to Henry Funk, Dielman Kolb, Christian Moyer, Jr., and Abraham Reiff ten acres of land, part of his homestead tract. All were residents of Franconia, except Dielman Kolb, who was of Salford. Funk was a bishop, Kolb a minister, and Moyer and Reiff deacons. On this tract there was already a 'tenement', likely already used for school and church services . . . . The building of a new church house was immediately commenced, with accommodations at the east end of the house for day school, which was not relinquished till about 1840." This school was practically a church school. Christopher Dock who is known in history as "The Pious Mennonite School Teacher", taught here for many years. He had a farm in Salford. Ex-Governor Samuel Pennypacker some time ago revived his history which has since become famous.

Strassburger in his *History*, commenting on the Salford church and school also says: "Matters appear to have gone well and the church prospered. In time, however, it was considered to the advantage of the church that a new congregation be organized at Franconia, for the use and greater convenience of those of the faith residing in that locality, which was then called Indian Field. A new deed was executed in order to convey back to the congregation in Salford a 'Declaration of Trust', from the two surviving trustees residing in Franconia township to the two others of Salford. This second paper dated March 25, 1763, recites that Dielman Kolb and Heinrich Funck are dead, and Christian Moyer and Abraham Reiff are the survivors of the 'trustees' while Jacob Clemens and Christian Funck represent the congregation."[1]

Dielman Kolb made his last will July 8, 1748, and it was proved April 30, 1757, nine years later. In his will he named as his trustees his "loving and trusty friend Heinrich Funck" and John Ulrich Bergey. He provided well for his widow, Elizabeth, during her natural life. His extensive land holdings, plantations, and tenements whatsoever were willed to his legal heirs and representatives, and to the "Congregation of ye Dutch Mennonists in Salford," he gave 2 £ 10 s. and to the Mennonists of "Perkyomin

1. Strassburger, *op. cit.* pp. 406 ff.

& Skepack," a like sum. In this he did not slight the congregation of his loving and trusty friend, Heinrich Funck of Franconia, for there was no church organization there before 1763, and Bishop Heinrich Funck died in 1760. Hence the congregation at Franconia must have been organized by Heinrich Funck's son, Christian Funck, who himself says that he was ordained a bishop in his father's stead in 1761.

Dielman Kolb died December 28, 1756. David Schultze of Goshenhoppen, the surveyor, who kept an extensive notebook and diary, entered the following: "Der alte Dielman Kolb zu Shippack is auch gestorben d. 28th xbr." And then on December 30: "Went to Shippack to the burial." However there seems to be little doubt that he was buried in the graveyard adjoining the church in Salford, which he so long and faithfully served. David Schultze was a Schwenckfelder and surveyor who lived in the Goshenhoppen region, and he may not have been sufficiently familiar with the Kolbs as ministers, as Martin and Henry, two brothers of Dielman, were at the same time ministers at Skippack, and besides Skippack was the seat of the Conference and both congregations might be considered as practically one. He was in his sixty-seventh year, not having quite reached the allotted three score and ten. While no monument marks his last resting place, his name for all time will be indissolubly linked in love and veneration with the Mennonite history of Pennsylvania.

Dielman was a minister of the Mennonite Church, though, as was customary at the time, he engaged in other occupations as well. Besides carrying on extensive farming, he was a weaver. He appears to have been exceptionally prominent in the affairs of the Mennonite Church, and to have been noted for his religious zeal. He was very intimate with Heinrich Funk, whom he himself calls in his will, "my trusty friend", who was also a minister and bishop of the church. It was through the perseverance and zeal of these two men that the Mennonite Church at Salford was organized in 1738. These men were not only zealous in their own immediate settlement, but had a missionary spirit to spread the Gospel beyond their immediate confines. About the same time they held services at the Goshenhoppen region five miles to the north at the same place where the Lutheran and Reformed also worshiped. This union existed for over fifty years. Christian Funck, who succeeded his father as bishop, himself writes concerning a communion held at Goshenhoppen.

In collaboration with Bishop Henry Funck, Dielman Kolb supervised the translation of T. J. Van Braght's *Bloedigh Tooneel* (Martyrs' Mirror) from the Dutch into the German language in 1748, and certified to its correctness. The *Martyrs' Mirror* is a history of the defenseless Christians, who suffered and were put to death for the testimony of Jesus their Savior, from the time of Christ until the year A. D. 1660. It traces the history of those Christians, who from the time of the apostles held fast to the plain and non-resistant doctrine, as understood by the Church to this day. It also contains the confession of faith adopted by the different communities. These men had a great love for this book and considered it necessary that the young members should have the book to read to remind them of the faith and steadfastness of their fathers in the principles of the Church, especially the principle of non-resistance which was being threatened.

While tranquility reigned, and no great disturbances are recorded as having taken place during the formative period of the Church at Salford, Skippack, and Franconia, yet there was going on among the various denominations of the Province, intense religious agitation. The principle of religious toleration which William Penn incorporated in his government was new and never heard of before. It brought hither people of all types of faith, from Holland, Switzerland, Moravia, France, England, and Germany, whose destination was invariably the already well-established settlements near Philadelphia, from whence they radiated out into the country where churches were established by different denominations. There were among these newcomers Reformed, Lutherans, Dunkards, Schwenkfelders, and others that had no church affiliations at all. Strange to say, dissensions in regard to doctrine became violent and widespread. "Pennsylvania is a complete Babel," said Heinrich Goetschi, a Reformed minister of Philadelphia, in a letter to St. Peter's Church in Zurich. About the same time a Lutheran minister wrote concerning the state of their church, "There is only one Lutheran minister in the whole land, except Casper Stover, now sixty miles distant from Philadelphia." "It is an abode of all religious sects, a new heathenism is threatened with the destitution of pastors and schools." "The Germans imported with them all kinds of religious whimsies of their country, and I believe have been subdivided since their arrival here." "We live in a country full of heresy and sects, and

for as far as our interest is concerned, we are in a state of great destitution."

The *Chronicon Ephratense*, chronicle of the Seventh Day Baptist Church at Ephrata which was an aberration from the infant Dunkard Church, says: "About this time (1740) there were great disturbances in church circles in Pennsylvania so that many were so confused that they no longer knew what to believe."[1]

The serene and pious founder of our commonwealth could never have dreamed of such a result from his provision for freedom of conscience. It is astounding that a community, guaranteed liberty in this respect, should have become involved in religious strife, bigotry, fanaticism, and confusion. During all these trying early times, in and around the Germantown, Skippack, and Salford Mennonite communities, the churches went on steadfastly and peacefully with their work, not deviating in anything from the faith of their fathers, as once delivered to them. On the other hand, however, they had much in common with the churches of other denominations. Dielman Kolb and Heinrich Funck as we noted before organized a church at Goshenhoppen and worshipped at the same house as the Lutherans and Reformed for many years. At Rich Valley the Lutherans and Reformed worshipped together with the Mennonites and have privileges accorded to them in their church records. At Almont, in Bucks County on the Ridge, the Mennonites worshipped with the Lutherans and Reformed in the same house for over one hundred years. In Franconia the Mennonites worshipped together with the Schwenkfelders and have a union harvest home service every year to this day. While the Mennonite Church organizations at the places mentioned, except Franconia, have disappeared, the relations existing with these denominations were always pleasant and in Christian fellowship, and are so to this day. The decay was not brought about by strife or misunderstandings, but by the course of ordinary events. The extinction of early church organizations was nothing new and when the early Lutheran and Reformed Church fathers write about babel, heresy, fanaticism, and bigotry, they could not have meant the Mennonites for they were always in friendly relations with each other. On this point we have such testimonies as that given in connection with the death of Rev. John Philip Boehm, the first Reformed minister in America. "John Philip Boehm

1. *Chronicon Ephratense*, tr. by J. Max Hark. Lancaster, Pa. 1889.

suddenly died during the night on the 29th of April 1749. The day previous he held preparatory services to celebrate Holy Communion in the congregation. Michael Schlatter then was the only ordained Reformed minister in the country and he was away on missionary work. As no Reformed minister was at hand, Martin Kolb of Skippack, a worthy neighbor, and a teacher of sound doctrine of the Mennonite persuasion, was called to preach his funeral sermon." For thirty years, both Boehm and Kolb labored side by side in concord. Saur, the Germantown printer, in his newspaper of May 16th, 1749, in a suitable obituary, comments on the event. "When such circumstances would take place, not of necessity, but out of love, then all jealousy, sectarianism, and the like would take an end. How pleasant it would be then, when only one Shepherd and only one Flock would be."

It was not only the problems of establishing homes, schools, and Churches in a new and wild country that faced our early Church leaders. Men like Dielman Kolb, Heinrich Funck, and Martin Kolb, who at that time with Jacob Godschalk practically constituted the official body of the Church, also had to deal with the erratic doctrines brought from Europe by various newcomers. The Church had much to contend with during the formative period in America. At one time a group of people, Pietistic in belief, arrived in the Mennonite community, and brought with them a doctrine of no salvation except a baptism by trine immersion. Many were led to follow them. Later a section of this same group of worshipers changed the Lord's day to Saturday and even resorted to the rite of circumcision and in their zeal took a Mennonite by the name of Nagle, whom they not only rebaptized but with others also circumcised. Knowing that our Church fathers came into contact with fanaticism of this sort, no one needs to ask what were the early questions coming up in our first conferences in America. The Pietists mentioned above (later called Dunkards) in their missionary zeal preached trine immersion as an essential requirement for salvation to the neglect and detriment of the great doctrines of the Bible. At this juncture Heinrich Funck, Bishop of the church, wrote a Bible exposition on Baptism, entitled, "Ein Spiegel der Taufe, Mit Geist, Mit Wasser, und mit Blut". It was printed in Germantown by Christopher Saur in 1744. This was the first original literary production of the Mennonites in America. It has since gone through several editions. It was also once printed in Europe in 1844. In view of what was taking

place, this little book on baptism did much to enlighten those who were seeking light and sound doctrine on this subject.

There were other questions that the Church had to deal with also. The dress question by this time received some attention. The church having been founded so close to Philadelphia, and members coming in contact with the city fashions there, and the disturbance of war coming on, at a conference it was decided best for the church to adopt the plain Quaker apparel. There is, however, reason to believe that the early church before this time dressed plainly and modestly, abstaining from vain show in all things.

In all of the work of the early Mennonite Church, whether dealing with problems of life and faith, or with the establishment of new colonies and congregations, we may be sure that Dielman Kolb played a leading role, sound, sensible, practical. In his hands and those of his co-workers, the infant American Church was firmly established in the character it had in Europe, a simple fellowship of believers, determined to live a holy and useful life in all sobriety to the glory of God and the welfare of fellowman. May this brief sketch be a tribute to their life and labors and may it aid in keeping green the memory of their service.

NEW SOURCE MATERIAL FOR THE HISTORY OF THE MENNONITES IN ONTARIO

Harold S. Bender

I. A List of Claims by Residents of (present) Waterloo County, mostly Mennonites, for losses suffered when employed in military transport, in October, 1813.

II. Outline of several journeys from Eastern Pennsylvania to Waterloo Township and return in 1817, 1819, and 1845, by Joseph Bowman.

III. Statistics regarding Mennonite ministers and population in Ontario about 1825.

IV. A Form for the Oath of Allegiance.

* * * * *

I

A List of Claims by Residents of (present) Waterloo County, mostly Mennonites, for losses suffered when employed in military transport, in October, 1813.

The small settlement of Mennonites along the Grand River in what is now Waterloo County, Ontario, had been begun in the spring of 1800. Scarcely had the settlers secured their lands and begun to develop them, when the War of 1812, between England and the United States, broke out. Although the theatre of action never came near enough to the settlement so that the actual dangers of war threatened, the campaign in the vicinity of Detroit affected the little colony directly. Forced to use all possible resources at their command, the British officers impressed the available inhabitants into military transport service in September, 1813.

Traditions of experiences which came to those impressed into this service have been handed down in the families of their descendants. In the family of the mother of the writer who is descended from the Bechtels and Wanners, traditions are still kept of this impressment, and of the diet of beans which was furnished by the commissary. Deacon George A. Weber of the First Mennonite Church in Kitchener, Ontario, remembers hear-

ing his grandmother relate the story of her father's (John Schierich) experiences on this occasion. Schierich, a young man at the time, related that as the company had encamped at Moraviantown, not far from Bothwell, between Detroit and London, with the supplies of the retreating army, just as the meal was ready, word came that the enemy (the Americans) were coming. All jumped for their horses and fled for their lives. Former Mayor D. N. Panabaker of Hespeler, President of the Waterloo County Historical Society, related an interesting tradition in the same connection on the occasion of the recent annual meeting of the Society. His great grandfather, Cornelius Pannebecker, a recent settler, endeavored to thwart the plans of the military authorities by taking his wagon into his blacksmith shop and removing the tires so that it would be unfit for hauling supplies. However, since he could not remove the feet from his horses the horses were impressed into service, and his son was required to drive them to a neighbor's wagon.

Hitherto it had been impossible to verify these traditions from any source whatsoever, so slight is the available source material on early Mennonite History in Ontario. During the past year however a first-class source-document was discovered in the military archives at Ottawa, Ontario. The President of the Waterloo County Historical Society, Mr. D.N. Panabecker of Hespeler, disclosed the fact of the discovery to the writer on the occasion of a personal call during the past summer of 1928. With his kind consent the document is printed here in full with the accompanying letter from its discoverer, Col. E. A. Cruikshank of Ottawa.

The original spelling, even of the names, has been retained. Since the spelling of the names may obscure the identity of some of the individuals, it may be of value to notice the following modern forms of the names: Bechdel - Bechtel; Wissamer - Wismer; Shiesich, Shierich - Shiry; Bien and Been - Biehn or Bean; Ebey - Eby; Pliem - Bleam. The symbols N. Y. C. mean "New York Currency".

Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada.
53 Wilton Crescent, Ottawa, Ont.
6 June, 1928.

Dear Mr. Panabaker:

* * * * *

I am taking the liberty of enclosing herewith a statement of the

losses of certain residents of Block Number 2 when employed in military transport on October, 1813, which I have lately discovered and transcribed, thinking it might be of interest to you and other members of the Society. You will observe among the names a kinsman or perhaps an ancestor of yourself and several other familiar surnames. These men it would appear were impressed to enable Major General Procter to retreat with his small division of regular troops from Detroit after the defeat of the British squadron on Lake Erie on 10 September, 1813. He was overtaken and his force was dispersed by a greatly superior enemy near the Moravian village on the Thames on 5 October, 1813. The Captain Chissom mentioned in the statement was probably Captain John Chisholm, who commanded a flank company of the 2nd Regiment of York militia, within the limits of whose regimental area Block No. 2 was situated and who seems to have been the impressing officer. I have not found any mention of the capture of these teams in any other place and you may consider this document of sufficient importance to warrant its publication in some future report.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

E. A. Cruikshank.

D. N. Panabaker, Esq.,

President Waterloo Historical Society,

Hespeler, Ont.

P. S. The transcription is literal from the manuscript presented to the Board of Claims.

Statement of Losses

November the 1st 1813. This is Concerning the Property or Propertys of the Inhabitants Liveing in Block Number Two near the Grand River these inhabitants was Prest to take there Loads to the Troyt (Detroit) which the(y) did and got there Back Loads and got on Back as far as two Miles at this side of Morravian Town where they got Orders to make there Escape from the Enimy as well as they cold, excepting one man with waggon and two horses was taking Prisoner by the Enimy.

	N. Y. C. £	s.	d.
The said George Bechdel Lost is a waggon one horse and harniss and halter chain one new Blanket and a Grate Coat and a Three Bushel Bag	90	0	0
The said Property of John Bricker which is Lost is one horse harniss and halter Chain and Pare of Saddlebags and a Three Bushel Bag	60	0	0
The Property of Joseph Wissamer is one waggon, three Bushel Bags, one Blanket	65	0	0
The Property of Jacob Snyder is one waggon one Log Chain and three Bags	67	0	0
The Property of Peter Erb is one waggon one horse and harnis a Log Chain and Six Three Bushel Bags and a halter Chain and a Blanket	90	0	0
The Property of Joseph Snyder is one waggon and a Yoke of Cattle and a Log Chain and two Bags	110	0	0
The Property of Gerhart Wieler is one waggon and a Log Chain	55	0	0
The Property of John Shiesich is one waggon one set of harnis five Bags two halter Chains and Crasslines	77	0	0
The Property of Henry Wanner is one waggon one horse and harnis five bags	128	0	0
The Property of Christian Richert is one waggon and harnis for one horse and a lieding Chain and two bags and Two Blankets and Crosslines	70	0	0
The Property of Samuel Slichter is the harnis for one horse and one bag	6	0	0
The Property of John Bien is one waggon and harnis for one horse and two Bags. John Been has goot his wagien again	48	0	0

The Property of Jacob Bechdel is one waggon which was aprassed by Capt. John Chissom and John Erb Esquire	75	0	0
The rest of said Jacob Bechdels Property is the harnis for one horse and Part of the harnis for another horse and four Bags	10	0	0
The property of Joseph Eby is one waggon which was apprassed by Capt. John Chissom and John Erb Esquire	75	0	0
The rest of Joseph Ebys Property is the harnis for four hourses and a Compliet good Saddle and Eight three Bushel Bats two good Blankets	45	0	0
The Property of Abraham Bien is harnis of one horse	7	4	0
The Property of Cornelius Pannebecker is the harnis of one horse a forkid Chain and two Swingletrees, five thre Bushel Bags	8	0	0
The Property of Phillip Pliem is one waggon	60	0	0
The Property of Samuel Betzner is the harnis for two horses a Jackscrew and a forkid Chain and two Swingletrees and Six three Bushel Bags one Bucket Bound with Iron hoops and a Tarpot	27	16	0
The Property of Jacob Erb is one yoke of Cattle and a Log Chain and two Bags	45	0	0
Henry Lund One Waggon	32	10	0

List of Clames

II

Outline of Several Journeys from Eastern Pennsylvania to Waterloo Township and Return in 1817, 1819, and 1845

The route of the emigrants from Eastern Pennsylvania to Ontario has been known in a general way. It has also been known that this route was used not only by the original emigrants on

their first trek, but was followed numerous times by travelers who made visits back and forth. Although the route was difficult and long, over 400 miles, the amount of travel back and forth over it was remarkable. Often the trip was made on foot, and almost every Waterloo County Mennonite family has traditions of such journeys. At times wagons, and even light buggies were driven back and forth. One of the latter which made four trips back and forth to Pennsylvania in the early days, is preserved in the Waterloo County Historical Society rooms.

The location of the exact route followed by these travelers is an interesting question. It is answered by records of several trips made by Joseph Bowman of Waterloo, which he jotted down in a little notebook. Family tradition has it that Bowman was a great traveler, having made the round trip to Pennsylvania more than 20 times. These records are here printed for the first time through the kind permission of Ira Bauman of Waterloo, Ont., a lineal descendant of Joseph Bowman, who is now the possessor of the notebook.

On a return trip to Reading in 1819 Bowman followed a different route. His outline of this trip is as follows:

Description of the Road from Reading to Waterloo Township, Halton County, Upper Canada. Joseph Bowman, started September the 4th, 1817, and arrived in Waterloo, October the 2d., 1817.

From Reading to

	Mile
Kergerstown	10
Orwigsburg	11
Sunbury	47
Northumberland	2
Milltown	12
Bensborough	14
Muncy Creek	2
Williamsport	12
Heur's tavern	17
Blockhouse	14
Peters Camp	12
Widow Berry	18
Addam Hart	6
Thomas Mayberry	20
Robert Patterson	6

Joseph Bowman started from Waterloo, February the 9th, 1819, and arrived in Reading, February the 27th, 1819.

	Mile
From John Erb's Mill to Jacob Myer	60
Cadareenstown (St. Cath.)	8
Queenstown	12
Morehous's tavern	25
Olarged Creek	13
Tillanson's tavern	28
Rochester	11
Pitsford	8
Cannandaigua	21
Benyang (Penn Yang)	22
Head of Sennaka Lake	30
Coryell's tavern	7
New Town	15
Lowman's tavern	7

Mulhollans tavern	20
Dreisbachs tavern	3
Bigtree	15
Genasee River	7
Calladony Town	7
Davis's tavern	4
Leroyl	3
Battavia	11
Richardson's tavern	11
Hersy's tavern	15
Buffalo	14
Blackrock ferry	2
John Boyer	10
Fall	8
Jacob Myer	20
Carpenter's Tavern	13
Dundass	18
John Erbs Mill (Preston)	23
Miles	429
Tioga point	14
Shaw's tavern	6
Brown's tavern	27
Smith's Ferry	30
Wilksberry	20
Rack's tavern	17
Mirwein's tavern	16
Dreisbach's Mill	6
Lehigh Water Gap	12
Falk's tavern	12
Richard's tavern	8
Kutstown	6
Reading	17
Mile	458
Spending Money	$22.53

Joseph Bowman made numerous other trips back and forth. In the same notebook he records a trip made by Joseph Bowman & Wife from Waterloo to Lancaster County, Pa., leaving August 18, 1845. He outlines the trip as follows:

> T. Erbs Mill, Tilman Myer, St. John, Falls, Blackrock ferry, Buffalo, Williamsville, Batavia, Pavilion, Moscow, Genasee River, Densville, Liberty, Bath, Painted Post, Kern's tavern, Lawrenceville, Tioga village, Mansville, Covington, Blasburg, Blockhouse, Bastian's Tavern, Wagoner's Tavern, Drum's Tavern, Williamsport, Lewisburg, Selinsgrove, Liverpool, Newport, Bloamfield, Landesburg, Abraham Bowman. The trip totaled 402 miles.

The return trip, starting from Philadelphia on October 7, 1845, and arriving at Waterloo on the 21st of the some month, runs as follows:

> Philadelphia, Bethlehem, Nazareth, Wind gap, Knecht's Tavern, Smith's Tavern, How's Tavern, Salem, Belmont, Sweet's Tavern, Great Bend, Pennsylvania Line, Binghamton, Union, Campville, Owego, Ithaca, Trumansburg, Oved, Genava, Canandagua, West Tavern, Caladony, Leroy, Butavia, Clarenceville, Williamsville, Buffalo, Blackrock, Falls, St. Johns, Tilman Myer, J. Erb's Mill. This trip totalled 485 miles, largely because of the start from Philadelphia.

The notebook also contains a few interesting notices regarding commissions to be filled such as the transfer of money back and forth for various friends, the purchase of some goods, and especially books.

III.

Statistics Regarding Mennonite Ministers and Population in Ontario about 1825

Those who have made any study at all of Mennonite History know that it is excessively difficult to secure reliable information of a statistical nature. The almost complete lack of church records of any sort, even at the present time, renders almost impossible any reliable conclusions. Occasionally by chance the desired information is preserved and unearthed in wholly unexpected regions. The conditions regarding statistics of the Mennonites in Ontario are not different from conditions in other sections. However, by chance, the writer discovered two reliable sources of information regarding the names of ministers and the number of members in Ontario in the very earliest days. This information is presented herewith as found.

The first source is a letter written from Berlin, Ontario (now Kitchener) in 1825 by a layman, which contains the names of ministers listed according to districts. The second source is an extract from a government document printed at York (now Toronto) in 1828. It represents an attempt at an early religious census of the province. Accurate census figures were not regularly compiled in the province until 1851.

A final section is devoted to a comparison of the data found in these two sources with other sources of a later date, also a general summary.

A List of Mennonite Bishops, Ministers, and Deacons in Canada in 1825

On November 28, 1825, Joseph Snyder of Berlin, Ontario, addressed a letter to his brother Henry Snyder of East Donegal, Lancaster County, Pa., in which among other things he listed the bishops, preachers, and deacons of the Mennonite Church in Ontario. This letter is now in possession of H. N. Nissley, of Mt. Joy, Pa., a descendant of Henry Snyder. It is interesting to compare this list with the one contained in the official Legislative Committee report in 1828 which follows. The names are arranged according to districts.

MARKHAM
Abraham Groff, Bishop
Daniel Kreider, Preacher
Christian Weidman, Deacon
David Metzler, Deacon
Peter Musselman, Preacher
Jacob Smith, Deacon

STONY CREEK
Samuel Swartz, Preacher
Benjamin Huber, Deacon

CLINTON (Vineland)
Jacob Moyer, Bishop
Jacob Moyer, Preacher
John Fretz, Deacon
Jacob Frey, Deacon
Christian Hunsberger, Deacon

BLACK CREEK (Falls)
Geo. Zewitz, Preacher
John Wenger, Deacon

WILMOT TWP.
John Gingrich, Deacon
John Weaver, Deacon

WATERLOO
Benjamin Eby, Bishop
Joseph Bauman, Preacher
Joseph Bechtel, Preacher
Martin Baer, Preacher
Henry Shue, Preacher
Henry Weber, Preacher
Christian Boesinger, Deacon
Jacob Bechtel, Deacon
Abraham Clemens, Deacon
Samuel Eby, Deacon
Peter Burkhart, Deacon
Jacob Snyder, Deacon

A Government Report of 1828

THE REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE to which was referred the petitio nof Bulkley Waters and others, entitled — The Petition of Christians of all Denominations in Upper Canada and other Petitions on the Same Subject, and the Petition of E. W. Armstrong and others. Committee, Marshall Bidwell, Chairman. Ordered by the House of Assembly to be Printed, March 1828.

York: Printed by W. L. Mackenzie
1828

* * * * *

A Mr. Morrison tells how this report was prepared. The following is his account quoted from the printed report.

At a public meeting in York, a committee was appointed, called the Central Committee of Upper Canada, and directed to correspond with the other parts of the province to suggest the appointment of committees and to request that they would carefully collect and transmit to the Central Committee at York, accurate information respecting the number of persons belonging to the religious denominations in their neighborhood. In consequence of these, communications were received from various parts of the province, containing correct and full information upon this subject, obtained from personal knowledge or inquiry, and authenti-

cated by the signatures of respectable inhabitants. This information was pretty general with respect to all the Methodists and Baptists; and with regard to the others the committee, in addition to the information obtained in this way, collected from all other sources the most accurate information that could be got. The chart was formed from the material thus obtained, and presents in my opinion a very complete and fair view of the number of ministers, and number of the different religious denominations in this province. I have a copy of this chart which I will leave with the committee.

ECCLESIASTICAL CHART OF UPPER CANADA

* * * * *

DISTRICT	MINISTERS	BIRTHPLACE	IN CAN.	M'B'RS	HEAR'S
Gore	Benjamin Eby		24 years		
Dunkards	Joseph Bechtel		25 years		
and	Joseph Bowman	German Descent	11 years	600	1200
Menonists	Martin Baer		11 years		
	H. Shoe		11 years		
	H. Weaver		11 years		
	Peter Noffziger	Germany	2 years		
	Joseph Goldsmith	Germany	4 years		
	John Brenneman	Germany	4 years		
	Christian Stunman	Germany	2 years	107	357
	Abram Widmore	United States	24 years		
	George Shupe	United States	30 years		
Niagara	Jacob Moyer, Sen. & Jr.		28 years	250	400
	George Tavitz	German Descent	37 years		
	Samuel Swartz		28 years	207	431
	Four no names				

A comparison of the names in the above chart with the list of Mennonite Ministers and Deacons as given in Joseph Snyder's letters in 1825 is necessary to provide a corrective to the government report. Apparently the legislative committee failed altogether to discover the presence of the large colony of Mennonites in Markham Township, but 20 miles or more north of York, which had been there for nearly 25 years, unless the "Four no names" at the bottom of the list might refer to the Markham ministers. Snyder lists three ministers in 1825 at Markham, and there might well have been a fourth ordained in the following three years. The report is shown to be defective then in this respect. The fact

that the "four no names" appear under Niagara District is also disturbing, since there was no other Mennonite settlement in the Niagara District except those at Clinton and at the Falls where Tavitz was minister. It is possible of course that the "four no names" were Dunkard ministers in this region.

On the other hand the report is shown to be accurate for Waterloo. The names of Widmore and Shupe are necessarily Dunkards since Snyder does not include them in his list. The names of the four preachers from Germany are those of Amish ministers, as will be recognized by those who know the Amish settlement there. Other information confirms the fact that Widmore and Shupe were Dunkard ministers. In this case, the name "Dunkard" means "River Brethren", that is "Brethren in Christ".

An interesting question is raised by the figures of membership and hearers. A total of 1164 communicants is reported. Of this number the Dunkards certainly form a very small part, possibly not over 15 or 20. 107 are Amish. This leaves something over 1,000 Mennonites, truly an enormous number. Since most of the immigrants had not been in their new home more than 15 years, it may be inferred that as many as 600 or more members immigrated from Pennsylvania to Ontario. The Amish contingent had been in the land for but 2-4 years. "Hearers" must include adherents, such as children and adult non-members. The total here is 2388.

An interesting comparison with these data is to be found in a summary of the number of the ministers and deacons of the Mennonite Church in Ontario in 1839 which was written in a letter to Europe by Benjamin Eby in 1839, 14 years after Joseph Snyder's list was prepared. The content of this letter is printed in the "Mennonitische Blaetter" of Danzig, Germany, for May, 1854. Eby states that there are four bishops. In his own district (Waterloo) there are 12 meeting-houses, 1 bishop, 14 preachers, and 12 deacons. In the Markham district there are 3 meeting-houses, 1 bishop, 3 ministers, and 4 deacons. In the Niagara district there are 4 meeting-houses, 2 bishops, 4 ministers, and 5 deacons. A conference is held annually. Eby's list thus totals 4 bishops, 21 ministers (a total of 25 preachers), and 21 deacons.

A later comparison can be made with a summary report made by John Baer of Waterloo in a letter to Europe, which was printed in the *Mennonitische Blaetter* for December, 1858. Baer lists 1 bishop and 5 ministers in Markham; in Lincoln County, Clinton

Township, 1 bishop and 2 preachers, with two meeting-houses. In the Waterloo district he names 2 bishops (Joseph Hagey and Henry Schantz), 17 preachers, 14 deacons, with 17 meeting-houses. He divides them according to townships as follows: Waterloo—1 bishop, 10 preachers, 8 deacons, 7 houses; Wilmot—3 houses, 3 preachers, 3 deacons; Woolwich—3 houses, 3 preachers, 1 deacon; Dumfries—2 houses, 1 preacher, 1 bishop, 1 deacon; Blenheim—1 house, no ministers, 1 deacon; Blandford—1 house, no servants at all. An addition of Baer's list totals 5 bishops, 24 ministers, with deacons listed only for Waterloo. He fails likewise to include some of the smaller congregations in his ministerial list.

IV.

A Form for Oath of Allegiance

A copy of the following form for Oath of Allegiance is to be found in the Provincial Archives at Toronto, Ontario. All evidence of date is absent, but the printed *s* used is the old form.

Form for Oath of Allegiance.

I certify that ..... of .....

....., being a Quaker, Menonist, or Tunker, has made and subscribed the solemn Affirmation and declaration of Allegiance required by law, before me,

this ..... day of ..... in the year of our

Lord .....

THE HUTTERIAN BRETHREN' 1528-1929

A Story of Martyrdom and Loyalty

John Horsch

(Continued)

III.

The Decline and Destruction of the Hutterian Brotherhood

During the first century of the history of the Hutterian Brotherhood a number of the head pastors were men of exceptional ability. Among them may be mentioned, besides Jacob Hutter, Peter Riedemann of Silesia, 1542-1556, Peter Walpot of the Tyrol, 1565-1578 (who as a boy of eight years had witnessed the heroic death by fire of George Blaurock in 1529, at Clausen in the Tyrol), Claus Braidl of Hesse, 1583-1611. The last of the outstanding leaders was Andreas Ehrenpreis who was head pastor from 1639 to 1662. He undertook with considerable success to check the spiritual decline which had been noticeable for some time.

Various causes for the prevailing decline may be noted. Quite a number who lacked religious conviction and consecration had united with the Church. Of this there is unmistakable evidence. For example, the chronicler states that in 1586 a few hundred Swiss arrived in Moravia to unite with the brotherhood "many of whom had decided to come because of the famine" . . . . . "Yet they expressed a willingness to embrace the faith," he says further, "and amend their lives, and were accepted on trial in the hope that they would make good." This means that they were admitted into the communities and that those whose life gave no cause for complaint were eventually received into membership upon the confession of their faith.

In the first half century of the history of the Hutterian Brotherhood, living in a community of the Brethren was prized as a great privilege by the members of the Brotherhood, despite the restrictions which such a life entailed. When through force of circumstances brethren and sisters were separated from the community, there was a sincere longing for the "community of the

saints". Many extant letters bear testimony to this fact. In the great persecution of 1548, after having for weeks been living in the woods, the congregations saw themselves compelled because of the cold season to seek shelter and to separate into groups of about ten persons. "So they must part," says the chronicler, "and be scattered and separated from each other. This was to them the greatest distress of all. They would rather have suffered death, if it had been the Lord's will, than to be deprived of the privileges of Christian fellowship and attending the worship of the brotherhood."

In the first period of Hutterian history all members of the community willingly devoted their time and strength to the good of the common cause. The compelling motive was love to God and the brethren on the ground of sincere Christian conviction. This was evidenced by their willingness to suffer martyrdom. The members of the Church gladly served the Lord and each other by conscientiously attending to their daily duties. Every effort put forth in the work assigned to them was realized to be in the interest of the cause of Christ to which they had dedicated their lives. Those who worked for wages for the nobles and other employers turned their earnings over to the brotherhood, receiving in turn their clothes and other necessities of life from the "ministers of secular needs" in the communities.

But this idyllic state began to disappear while Claus Braidl was head pastor. It was found necessary in many of the various workshops to assign to every worker each day the amount of work he was expected to do. Various other problems and vexatious questions arose. Could one who had done his day's task work for his personal interest during the rest of the day, or after the regular working hours? If this was permitted, was there not the temptation to be more concerned about the quality of the extra work than of that which was done for the community? And how about procuring the material needed for the irregular work? Would it not mean much inconvenience and extra effort for the foreman to keep account of the material used for the self-interest of the workers? Again, since there were many who did not approve of working for self-interest, would not brotherly unity and contentment be jeopardized under such an arrangement? Also among those who worked for wages for the nobility and other employers the question of extra work and extra compensation arose. Such questions came more and more to the foreground as

the earlier spiritual fervor and moral earnestness of the brotherhood waned.

Again, the undertaking of great business enterprises, such as contracting for the erection of large buildings for the nobles and others in Moravia and the adjoining provinces, did not prove to be to the highest spiritual interests of the Brotherhood. Neither was it consistent with the general character of the Church. It meant entering into competition against those who were not in a position to do the work at so low a price as the Hutterian communities.

A period of general decline came through the evil influences to which the brotherhood was subjected during the Thirty Years' War and the successive Turkish wars. A minister of the Hutterians, in a sermon preached in 1656 said: "How disastrous is the influence of the Thirty Years' War! How great the unrighteousness in which it has resulted! Everywhere it would take a month to describe these evils. And this evil leaven has contaminated our brotherhood and it is now almost impossible to set things in order again." Another Hutterian preacher of the same period said in a sermon: "It would require a whole day to speak of the various evils which have spread and taken root within thirty years. A plow drawn by a hundred horses could not go deep enough to root up these weeds." Andreas Ehrenpreis, in his farewell address shortly before his death, said:

"We know by the bitterest experience that the enemy is busily engaged in planting his abominable weeds into the church of the Lord. There is need, above all things, for prevailing prayer, for unrighteousness increases greatly not only among other people but among us as well."

The author of the so-called *Smaller Church Chronicle*, Johannes Waldner, says that in books written in this period complaint is found "that a majority of the brotherhood departed from the simplicity of Christ and the filial obedience which they owed to God and the Church, and followed only their own inclinations. They did not abide by any regulations and were no longer satisfied with the cut of clothing which until that time was in use in the Church. Especially those who were in the service of the lords began to dress in worldly fashion, indulged in covetousness and self-interest, secretly kept some of the money they had earned, became accustomed to the use of wine," etc.

While the right of doing extra work for self-interest was denied by the brotherhood and the leaders, an increasing minority desired

this departure from the old order. Also there was a steady increase in the number of the indolent who apparently had united with the Church from a desire to live of the fruit of the hard work of others, rather than from religious conviction. The many conscientious, earnest souls that were yet found in the community were confronted by the task of providing for this class, a task that was becoming more and more difficult, as may be further shown elsewhere.

The head pastors and their assistants and other leaders in the brotherhood united in strongly opposing the many innovations and abuses which found their way into the communities. They drew up "Ordnungen" (rules and regulations) for the members of various crafts. Not a few of these "Ordnungen" have come down to us, particularly from the time of Andreas Ehrenpreis. But it was found impossible to accomplish through law what had formerly been brought about through spontaneous Christian love. Self-seeking and a lack of brotherly love were manifested in many ways. Under these circumstances the community of goods became more and more of a burden. From this period dates the saying,

> Die Gemeinschaft waer' nicht schwer
> Wenn der Eigennutz nicht waer',

which might be translated thus:

> Communal life would not be hard
> If there were not such self-regard.

At Alwintz in Transylvania the brotherhood for a considerable time seems to have held to the old standards of the Church more faithfully than the older colonies in Hungary. The chronicler, having related the great loss through epidemics in 1622, says further:

> But, after they had faithfully endured tribulation and storms, God granted them a time of peace and quiet during which the Church was able to establish itself there, and God also blessed them with temporal goods. A large number of crafts of various sorts were established which had hitherto never been practised in the land: for this reason the Church received protection and full religious liberty from the Prince. The Prince was very favorably disposed toward them and took great pleasure in their industry, integrity, and piety. For this reason the

Church had to provide men for his service, and wherever the mills of the Prince were to be found in the land, there were members of the Church who were responsible for their operation. So in temporal matters the Church prospered indeed and was blessed by God so that it grew and was built up.

In the years 1663 and 1664 the buildings of a number of the colonies were destroyed by the Turks and 122 of the inmates were led away into slavery. At Alwintz the Bruderhof was burned in 1661; it was later rebuilt. Through this war, says the chronicler, "the whole brotherhood was again thrust into the greatest poverty, for even crops and garden produce were destroyed."

It was decided in a general meeting held at Szobotiste, April 7, 1665, to send two brethren to the Netherlands to lay the needs of the Church before the Mennonite congregations there. The delegates visited the churches in Holland, Zealand, Flanders, and Friesland and secured large contributions for the needs of the Brethren in Hungary.

The Abandonment of Community of Goods and Its Causes

In the year 1686 the brotherhood at Levar decided to abandon one of the great distinctive principles of the Hutterians, namely, the practice of the community of goods. Somewhat later similar action was taken by the other congregations. "Compelled by the greatest poverty," says the chronicler, "it was ordered that every one should pay for himself."

In the opinion of the chronicler, apparently, the cause of discarding the community of goods is to be found in the indigence of the brotherhood. Doubtless this was the immediate cause. However, in the course of their history the Brethren had repeatedly lost all their possesions and had been reduced to the bitterest poverty. The congregation which in 1528 moved from Auspitz to Austerlitz was nearly penniless. And in the persecution of the year 1535 the Brethren lost all their earthly possessions and suffered great need. Again in a later period, after their flight from Transylvania to Wallachia, as well as after their migration to Russia, great poverty prevailed.

The contemporary writings of the Brethren show that the abandonment of the community of goods had its primary cause in the inner, religious decline of the brotherhood rather than in material need. The spirit of Christian love and true brotherhood

had departed from the communities, as was pointed out above. In consequence the practice of community of goods became more and more burdensome and finally impossible. The writings of the Brethren of that period are filled with complaints about the un-Christlike spirit which was manifesting itself within the brotherhood in various ways. In addition to the pertinent quotations already given, the following citations shed further light on this question.

On the text Acts 2:47 ("They did eat their food with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God") a minister of the Brethren in that period said in a sermon:

> Christ the Lord and the beloved prophets, apostles and other disciples did not thus cry for wine and meat as is done to-day by some of the would-be pious. For as the wolf is shrieking, "Lamb, Lamb!" even so some of them cry, "Wine, wine! Meat, meat!" If they do not get it, the condition of their hearts is revealed by their words. They say, "I shall work according to the food I am given." The first Christians on the contrary ate their food with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God. They were satisfied with that which one was able to give. They behaved as true children of God, not as gluttons.

Another sermon from the same period, which treats of "the false brothers and step sisters", contains these sentences:

> We could mention by name many, indeed very many, who admire this verse (Psalm 127:2) and use it as an excuse for laziness and for serving their belly. Yea, they use such scriptures for an excuse to let their neighbor work beyond his strength. Thus they cause a wasting to the marrow of his bones. It is a great shame, says a preacher in the Bruderhof at Kessels-

dorf in 1655, if a member of the church of the Lord is truthfully accused of being frightfully lazy *("stinkfaul")*, doing scarcely as much work as a child could do, but being a hero or heroine when it comes to eating, drinking, sleeping and unnecessary expenditures. It is an abomination before God and all honest men. It will be followed by evil consequences.

It is very true, says a Hutterian preacher of that period, that this excellent practice of community of goods has brought forth many lazy people. Not a few of them have a way to make one believe that they are not able to work. They will hide themselves

among the pious souls who through sickness and feebleness are disabled. And, what is worse, when they do some work, it is for their own benefit. In their supposed weakness they become sleek and fat. It is, verily, not right before God and all men. And this is indeed the reason that the poverty of the brotherhood increases as it does, and no one will admit that he is guilty. Often, alas, the complaint is heard that while in former times all were intent upon doing good work, this is not now true, but instead there is laziness and listlessness. Many lounge about to pass the time. In short, there is no diligence, conscientiousness, nor conscience in evidence, such as there was formerly.

It may be reasonably supposed that the abandonment of communism resulted in the elimination of many false brethren who had lived off the bitter sweat of the pious souls who for a long period had maintained the community life against the greatest odds. The great persecutions of the following century showed that many members of the Brotherhood were ready to suffer and die for their faith.

In 1674 Leopold von Kolonitsch, one of the highest officials of the Hungarian government, showed himself a friend to the Brethren by intervening successfully in their behalf. A persecution arose in 1725 in which fifteen members of the church at Levar were seized and imprisoned to compel them to have their infants baptized by a Catholic priest. The brotherhood at this place finally yielded to this demand in the same year. The church at Szobotiste did likewise in 1733. However those who had been thus baptized were later, upon the confession of their faith, baptized by the pastor of the church.

In 1741 the Brethren, upon the demand of the authorities, sent two young men of the brotherhood to serve in the army.

Preceding the account of the final destruction of the brotherhood through a merciless persecution, one of the chroniclers relates the following:

> Thus we have recounted briefly and yet truthfully and accurately how the Brotherhood in Moravia began and through much severe tribulation grew, developed, and spread out, how they endured severe persecution for the sake of the faith, and finally, how, on account of their belief in the truth of God, they were driven out of the entire land of Moravia altogether, almost with empty hands, whereupon they migrated into Hungary

where they with great difficulty maintained themselves and passed through much calamity and misfortune, especially in the Turkish and Tartar war. Further, we reported how this noble Brotherhood began to decline in all the Christian virtues, and to decrease in number. By means of many unfaithful men a corruption came into the Brotherhood which the faithful brethren and elders were not able to overcome.

Since these descendants of the Hutterian Brotherhood had forsaken their first love and lost their pristine purity and rectitude, and had in many respects fallen away and had not walked faithfully in the light of the Gospel, God finally withdrew from them His light and grace and permitted deep darkness to come upon them. As time went on, they fell away farther and farther, going from one error into another, until finally they even lost their name and had to accept the papal religion, as we shall now briefly relate.

The Great Persecution in Hungary

The chronicler Johannes Waldner, author of the *Smaller Church Chronicle*, gives the following vivid description of the last great persecution of the Brethren in Hungary (modern Czechoslovakia), writing about three decades after these things had passed into history.

In the year 1759 when Maria Theresa was Empress, the clergy, especially the Jesuits and their crew, petitioned the Empress for permission to attack the Brotherhood, which they still accused of being an Anabaptist sect, and to compel it to accept the Catholic faith.

Now Maria Theresa was an arch-Catholic and a great friend of the priests and was very favorable toward them and could not easily refuse them anything. Wherefore the Jesuits readily received full authority to deal with the Brotherhood as they pleased.

Now when they had secured this authority, the clergy secured the help of the civil government, especially that of the lords of Sabatish (Szobotiste), and other lords of the land, since they all wanted to secure favor with the Empress. For this reason all willingly assisted

Now there was a great gathering for counsel which included the Jesuits who had the work in charge, the clergy of Sabatisch,

Levar and Trentschin, and the magistrates. These all took counsel how they might most effectively accomplish their program. They decided that it was best to attack all the congregations at all four places on the same day without warning, and seize the books. This they decided to do on the 25th of November.

However, one of the magistrates, out of sympathy and pity for the congregation at Trentschin, revealed the plot. The brethren there immediately sent messengers and reported it to the other congregations so that they might be able to hide the books.

When the appointed day arrived, the Jesuits came together with the magistrates, with footmen, horsemen, soldiers, and other fellows, attacked all four places at once with great display of force and wantonness, and set guards before the doors of the houses so that no one could go in or out. Thereupon all the men were called together and compelled to listen to a strict imperial mandate which among other things contained the following: That it was the earnest will and command of their Imperial Roman Majesty, since the books of the Anabaptist sect taught open heresy and damnable errors, that they (the books) should be brought together and destroyed, and whoever should refuse to deliver up such books would soon learn how they would be dealt with.

The brethren were not frightened by this sharp threat, but replied to the authorities that they could not do this, and would never do it. To them this would amount to surrendering their faith. However, if the authorities wished to use force, the brethren would not resist. Thereupon the authorities ordered the books to be taken by force. The godless crowd broke into the houses, hunted through all the corners and secret places, took as many books as they could find, and put them in chests which they sealed and took to the authorities. Although the best of the books had been successfully hidden, yet many were found and taken away, for there were a large number of books, as would be expected when one thinks how large the Brotherhood had been before.

One's heart aches when one thinks how many fine writings and books were lost in the plundering and destruction of the Brotherhood, which had been collected and written with so much care and labor by the dear old brethren for the good and

edification of the coming generations, and how they now came to such an end in that godless crowd where they were burned and devoted to other dishonorable purposes.

After this, the enemies were quiet for a time through the entire winter until Joseph's day (19th of March) of the following spring in the year 1760. At this time the magistrates came again to Sabatisch. It was Count Nyari (who was one of the landlords of the Brethren) with his men. They fell upon the Brotherhood unawares as they had gathered one evening in the meeting house. It was a terrible night. They came with horse and wagon, with horsemen, footmen and other retainers, with drawn swords, rioting and raging outrageously as though they wanted to destroy everything. The congregation was so frightened that one sister swooned away and died. The godless crowd cursed and swore and the congregation had to patiently bear it.

Then each one was examined individually and each replied that he could not accept the Catholic faith. Not long thereafter the authorities came again. The people were called together and received a new imperial decree of the following content: It was the Empress' earnest command that the Anabaptist sect should not be tolerated in the land, but should be at once extirpated and destroyed. However, the Empress was willing to be gracious toward them if they would accept and acknowledge the four following points: first, that infant baptism is true Christian baptism; second, that the body of Christ is present in the holy sacrament just as he hung on the cross; third, that civil government is Christian; fourth, that the swearing of oaths is allowable. If they would accept these, they would be tolerated in the land and would be taken into the imperial favor and protection.

Thereupon the assembled brethren unitedly declared that they could not do this, and proved on the basis of the Holy Scriptures that the four above named points conflict with the word and truth of God.

Now when the enemies of the truth of God saw that the brethren would not likely be moved, they began in earnest to use force. The magistrates came again with an imperial decree bringing a clever Jesuit with them. They collected the people in the meeting house, and announced that the Jesuit was appointed by the Empress as their preacher, whom they should

hear and obey and from whom they should receive instruction, while on the other hand the ministers of the Brotherhood were forbidden to teach and preach.

The Jesuit took his place in the pulpit and began to preach in the presence of the magistrates; the congregation had to listen and look on. The horsemen stood beside the door and let no one out.

The Jesuit undertook to prove infant baptism as right on the basis of the Holy Scriptures. He began with a meek appearance, wiped his eyes with a cloth as though he were shedding tears, and said, "I cannot speak for pain of heart." He clapped his hands and said, "Almighty God have mercy on this poor folk who have been so shamefully misled. They will not accept the baptism which Christ and the Apostles have ordained, but make use of another baptism which the devil and his cohorts have given them." Further infamous words followed.

Such a speech was so exasperating to the brethren that one brother, by name Abraham Tschetterle, could not remain silent but interrupted the Jesuit in the presence of the entire meeting and the magistrates and said, "Oh thou miserable blind man. It is a pity that you have been so perverted. The baptism which Christ ordained and commanded, and which the Apostles used, this you say is of the devil; and the baptism which the Roman Pope or some other church father established according to his own notions, this you consider as the Christian baptism, of which, however, not a single letter is to be found in the Holy Scriptures. Oh thou miserable man." Thereupon the magistrate commanded him to be quiet and threatened him with many things and wrote down his name. Soon he was seized and taken away about fifty miles to the town of Erlau where he was put into a Jesuit monastery.

Following this the authorities appointed two Jesuits as preachers for the Brotherhood, one at Sabatisch and one at Levar, and issued a strict decree that whoever would not attend their teaching and preaching in the Catholic church should be brought to court under arrest. The meeting houses at Sabatisch and Levar were closed and sealed.

But regardless of the severity of the decree the people did not attend the preaching of the Catholic Church. This was reported to the authorities by the Jesuits.

The Persecution Begins in Earnest

Later again many clerical and civil lords gathered at Levar at the Bruderhof. Among them were the judge, magistrate, superintendent, and other officials, two deans, the pastors of Sabatisch, Levar, and other towns, horsemen, etc., altogether a large company. All the brethren were summoned together and were sternly commanded to obey and attend only the Catholic church where they would hear the Jesuit sermons. But the brethren utterly refused to do this, and there was much discussion and argument. The entire company remained all day long, eating and drinking, all at the expense of the Brotherhood so that altogether they consumed food to the amount of 80 Gulden, which amount the Brotherhood had to lay before the lords on the table that evening. This they repeated often. They conducted themselves in like manner at Sabatisch where almost the entire communal property was thus consumed. When finally the Brotherhood had no more money to give, the lords confiscated a piece of land and sold it to some noble-man for half price. By this process of plunder and outrage, the Brotherhood fell into great poverty and need.

Brother Zacharias Walter, Elder at Sabatisch, was imprisoned in the Jesuit monastery at Ofen, Brother Heinrich Mueller in the monastery at Gran in Upper Hungary. The other three elders, namely Tobias Pulman and Heinrich Kuehn of Sabatisch, and Heinrich Pulman of Levar, were imprisoned, but it is not known exactly where.

Later, the Jesuits were furnished horsemen by the authorities with which they went from house to house, and drove the people by force into the churches, setting guards at the church doors so that no one could go out. If someone refused to go, he was beaten.

After a few days another company of these godless fellows came again to Levar and Sabatisch with footmen, horsemen and other soldiery, bringing many wagons and peasants with them. Nobody knew what was in store. The Brotherhood was summoned. The authorities began to insist on their previous requirements. But the brethren absolutely refused everything since they knew at once that if they should go into the churches, other things would follow.

Then the authorities commanded their servants to fall to. Scarcely had the command been given when the servants fell

to work industriously and bound and threw onto the wagons the ministers and then most of the older brethren. They were taken bound to various prisons in the surrounding towns. This happened in the year 1761 on the Saturday before Easter.

When the Elder at Levar, Heinrich Mueller, saw that the tribulation and suffering was increasing and that the enemies were really in earnest, he counselled with his people whether he should not take to flight so that the Brotherhood should not lose all its ministers, although he said he did not want to desert his flock but was ready to remain and suffer gladly with them if he could only protect them from harm. However he was ready to be satisfied with what the Brotherhood would decide. Thereupon they decided that they should stay together and await with patience what God had in store for them.

The Brotherhood in Flight

The remaining Brethren who had not been carried away as prisoners, now took to flight, and wandered about the entire summer and winter in misery in the forests, suffering great need. Wives and children were left at home in the houses, but they were occasionally able to steal back at night to them and secure a bit of nourishment. Not a one dared to let himself be seen by day. Every workshop was deserted, and the entire economic system went to pieces. No one could escape from the country for all roads were guarded and refugees were caught and returned. Upon being caught they were taken to the authorities, and if they refused to promise to attend the Catholic services they were thrown into prison. So they had to be prepared for all sorts of suffering and tribulation.

The brethren at Sabatisch fled to Levar since there were large forests in that vicinity. But they could not keep hidden long for they were sought out by hunters and reported to the authorities. For when it was cold they could not get along without fire, and then by the smoke their hiding places in the forest became known.

So finally, the officials and hunters and horsemen, together with many peasants, surrounded the forest, and caught at one time over fifty brethren, some of whom were in bad condition. All had their hands bound behind their backs and were thrown upon wagons and sleds. The brethren addressed the officials in all meekness suggesting that they should consider what they

were doing in their harsh and tyrannical treatment of them, whereas the biggest scoundrels and rascals were permitted to live peacefully in the villages and towns, while they who did not wish to do anyone the least harm had not even a place of refuge with the wild beasts in the forests. They (the brethren) had always been diligent in pursuit of justice and right, and had faithfully paid the Empress and their landlords the required tithes, taxes, and rents.

To this the officials replied: "We well know that we have no better folk than you on our lands. But since the Empress does not wish to tolerate you, we do not care to lose her favor on your account." And so they went ahead and bound them and led them off to prison. They first searched the brethren and took away from them all that was found on them. Even the ropes with which they were bound were bought at the expense of the Brotherhood.

Several days earlier three brethren had been sent across the border into Austria to buy bread. As they were returning they heard from afar the tumult of weeping and crying of their brethren who had been arrested, bound and beaten by the enemy. Thereupon they were sore dismayed, wept bitterly and cried to God in Heaven on behalf of the great suffering. Then they wandered about in the snow and cold most of the night, praying to God with tears for patience to endure.

They met two brethren who had been able to escape the enemy when the rest of the brethren were being captured in the woods, with whom they counselled and concluded to return to Sabatisch. So they returned thither through the forest, since they dared not show themselves by day on the roads. Finally they reached their wives and children at Sabatisch, to whom they related how that many brethren had been arrested and imprisoned. Those who had remained at Sabatisch also told of their suffering and misery for but few of the brethren were there since most of them lay in prison. The lords of Sabatisch had plundered their houses of all bed linen and other household goods. After this the sisters and children had concentrated themselves in a few houses and abandoned the rest.

Then the lords quartered 12 footmen and 2 officers upon them, who consumed the communal goods at Sabatisch and caroused outrageously. More than that, the lords required that the Brotherhood should furnish each officer a gulden a day in

addition to hay and oats for the horses.

The arrested brethren mentioned above were returned each to his own locality, some to Sabatisch and some to Levar, where they were put into prisons where they had to endure much cold and frost. Some of them had to hang in the stocks by one hand and one foot, not being able either to sit or to lie, much less to stand. They also had to endure much hunger and need.

A Number of Brethren Martyred

After they had lain in prison for nine weeks and the enemy saw that they had accomplished no change in the brethren, they began to use more severe measures, and decided to subject them to beatings in the attempt to force them to give up their faith.

The magistrates came to the brethren in the prisons and announced to them the decisions of the authorities, namely that they would have to lie down one after the other, and receive beatings every day until they should be ready to promise to turn Catholic. This he announced with a strong oath. At once the work was begun. Several brethren were taken from prison and led before the Count and his castle. The first one who was laid down and beaten endured 25 strokes bravely and did not yield an inch. He was thrown back into prison with the assurance that he would be beaten again on the morrow. The second one was laid down and endured seven or eight strokes, but then yielded and promised to turn Catholic. When they came to the third and were about to beat him, he said, "Shall I let myself be beaten for a long time and then turn Catholic in the end? I would rather do it without beating, etc."

Similar proceedings were carried out at Sabatisch. One by name Hans Schmid was beaten inhumanly and left in such a miserable condition that they had to carry him away in a linen cloth since the flesh fell away from the poor man's feet and legs.[65] Some of the brethren were so brutally beaten that they were crippled and ruined for life, and many never recovered, dying shortly thereafter.

These poor unfortunate men bemoaned pitifully in the hour of death their apostasy and denial of the divine truth and said, if they had only executed them with the sword or in some other way, they could have met death with joy, but the horrible beating they could not endure. Yea, they could have wished

that the enemy had only not ceased beating until they were dead, so that they might have attained a blessed end. But now they had suffered so much and had no comfort.

By this brutal treatment the rest were frightened, and discouraged one another, since they saw that no one was able to endure it; and so God withdrew his support from them.

So with the rest not many strokes were necessary, and one after the other denied the truth, and turned Catholic, and was released from prison.

Thereupon, when the others who had been able to escape and were scattered abroad here and there heard of this, they also lost heart and came forth, one after the other, and fell away just as in autumn the foliage falls from the trees when the time is ripe.

When the lay-members had all fallen away, there still remained the ministers who still lay in prison in the monasteries. These prospered after the flesh since they were allowed to have fine food and drink, and came home sleek and fat from prison after the others had all fallen away.

So all the brethren in Hungary fell away from the faith, and not a one remained faithful except Brother Heinrich Mueller, Elder at Levar who lay in prison at Gran in Upper Hungary. But that did not last long, for he was soon put out of the way. It was said of him that one evening he was having a hot disputation with the priests concerning the sacrament which the latter claimed according to their fleshly notions contained literally the corporal body and blood of Christ. He of course did not admit this and quoted among others the words of Christ in Matthew 15: "What goes into the mouth enters the stomach, etc.", and said further, "See to what a wonderful end your Christ comes." The priests took great offense at this and charged him with great blasphemy. That night he was killed and carried out to the Danube in the early morning and buried. God knows how they treated him and what sort of death he suffered. It is supposed that he was poisoned.

A lady of the nobility some years after this remarked in a conversation with the wife of one of the apostate brethren who had been a nurse in her home, that they had been altogether too kind to Heinrich Mueller; they should have cut his tongue from his throat for his evil words.

After this they all had to curse their former faith in the churches and swear an oath to remain true to the Catholic faith until death. But with what inner attitude many a one did this may well be surmised.

The Jesuit Delpini Among the Brethren at Alwintz in Transylvania

In the year 1762 persecution came likewise upon the Brotherhood in Alwintz in Transylvania. For before the enemies of the truth had completed their work at Sabatisch and Levar in Hungary, the leader of the Jesuits who was directing the entire movement, by name Delpini, went to the Empress at Vienna and reported that the Anabaptist Sect in Hungary had now been entirely exterminated and brought back into the fold of Catholicism, and that the remnants would be properly taken care of by his assistants. However, he reported, there were still some of these people at Alwintz in Transylvania, whither he would be ready to proceed and convert them to the Christian faith, if it were Her Majesty's wish. Whereupon he received full powers and authority. At once he wrote in the imperial name to the Governor of Hermannstadt in Transylvania, by whom the matter was further taken up, and a beginning made.

* * * * *

Thereupon, after eight days, the Jesuit Delpini came to the home of the Elder and had him announce that all the people must attend his preaching. So all the people assembled in the meeting-house, and the Elder and his assistants permitted the Jesuit to preach in the meeting-house. The latter took his place in the pulpit, while the ministers sat beside him on the bench and listened together with the congregation to what this false-prophet would bring forth.

The Jesuit took a text from the Gospel of John, Chapter 16, and dwelt especially on the verse where Christ said to his disciples, "I have yet much to say unto you, but ye are not able to bear it now." This he applied to the Brotherhood saying that they did not understand the Gospel sufficiently. Then he went on further with the words of Christ where he said, "But when He, the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all truth"; this he applied to himself. He was going to teach them the first elements of faith. Further he praised the Catholic faith, and told many stories of miracles and wonders performed

by saints, especially one about a Jesuit, such as he, who had removed a mountain. Further he continued in words which were given him by the spirit of error. When he was finished he stepped down from the pulpit and asked the congregation how they liked his sermon.

Thereupon Brother Joseph Kuhr arose, stepped to the pulpit and said to the Jesuit, "What you repeated from the Gospel, that I know as well as you, and what you said about your many saints, that I do not believe. And what you said further about a Jesuit who removed a mountain is a Jesuit lie. For Christ did not mean the natural mountains, and the apostles did not remove the natural mountains; the mountains have continued to remain just where God put them in the beginning. But Christ meant the mighty ones and leaders of this world, who often stand like mountains in the way of the pious folk, through whose faith they shall be removed."

But the Jesuit would not grant that he was wrong, and defended his teaching as best he could, and especially insisted that infant baptism was the true Christian baptism. But the above-named brother would not give him ground and resisted him with the testimony of the Holy Scriptures, yielding nothing.

After they had disputed for some time, Brother Joseph said to the Jesuit, "I hope by the grace and help of God that you will not succeed in making a Jesuit out of me, and from this day I shall no longer attend your preaching." Then he turned and addressed the entire congregation, saying, "Whoever counts himself a brother or sister in the church, let him testify to his faith and follow me." With these words he left the building. But not a single person followed him; even his own son remained seated with the others. From this one can see clearly their dejected and dispirited condition. Neither the Elder nor any other brother had interrupted the Jesuit with so much as a single word; rather all remained wholly silent.

Some time later the Jesuit met Brother Joseph on the street and shook his finger in his face threatening him, "Just wait, I'll teach you." The brother replied, "What will you teach me? You are not able to do more to me than God will permit."

The Jesuit soon saw that he could do nothing with him, and also that in addition he would urge the others to take courage and be steadfast, which the brother did. Once, when they had gathered for a meeting, he pled earnestly with the brethren with

uplifted hands, that each one should be strong in the faith and the truth. For these reasons the Jesuit found it desirable to get him out of the way as soon as possible.

On April 8, 1764, Brother Joseph was arrested on the instigation of the Jesuit and imprisoned at Clausenburg and Hermanstadt for more than 16 years.

The former Elder Mertl Roth was heard to express himself in the following manner: "We will not be able to maintain our position anyway, and after long resistance will finally have to become Catholic. God can easily bring it about again that by means of war we shall come under another government and then we can return to our faith again."

When those who were zealous saw what was about to happen, and that everything was tending toward apostasy and ruin, and that even among the best of the brethren no courage could be detected, and that they themselves were too weak to remain steadfast at this place, several decided to flee from Alwintz and go to Creutz, which is about 12 (German) miles from Alwintz, in the district of Hermannstadt. The matter was finally arranged and about 20 persons took to flight. But they had not proceeded far from Alwintz when they were arrested and returned to prison in the Castle. However, one, Jacob Stutz, escaped and reached the Brotherhood at Creutz, where he related what had happened to the others. (On the origin of the Bruderhof at Creutz see page 78.)

The Further Course of the Persecution

After this, Delpini kept imprisoned in the Castle for about three weeks those who had been caught. There they prayed, read, and sang with one another, and comforted one another in their tribulation with the Word of God. Then Delpini took the two oldest brethren, Johannes Stahl and Michael Wipf, out of the Castle at Winz and sent them as prisoners to Engeten, where they were put into a nasty, miserable dungeon, where all who were imprisoned soon became ill and many died. And so it went with Brother Michael who soon became severely ill and on account of this was released at the beginning of the year 1766. The others were released and sent to their homes except Joseph Weber. He was a native of Bohemia who had but recently come to Alwintz and joined the Brotherhood and who was still unmarried. Delpini had him put in irons in

the Castle and told the others that he would not release him until he should become a Catholic again as he had been before.

The others however held together and met in the house of Brother Michael Wipf. Although Delpini did not want this and severely enjoined them to remain in their own houses and forsake their meetings they would not be restrained from meeting.

So at this time there were three divisions in the Alwintz congregation: one faction had become Catholic, another faction held to the congregation at Creutz, while the third faction would not become Catholic and yet did not hold to the congregation at Creutz.

With the help of Brother Peter Miller of Creutz, a number of the brethren succeeded a second time in escaping from Alwintz and reaching Creutz.

But the brethren from Alwintz had scarcely been a fourth of a year at Creutz, when the impious Delpini wrote to the governor of Hermannstadt to send them back to Alwintz. And since Delpini had been sent by the Empress, no one dared to resist him, but rather industriously carried out his orders. So the brethren were taken back to Alwintz by force.

As before, they continued to meet at Michael Wipf's house, where they held together, and read, sang, prayed, and strengthened one another as best they could in their time of tribulation. At that time Brother Jacob Stutz was the most outstanding among them. He was well-versed in the Holy Scriptures, and in many other respects a very able man, although he also later gave way.

The Jesuit wanted to arrest him, but he was able to avoid him and hid himself. Later he was caught and kept in prison until he made the desired recantation.

Likewise the other brethren could not stay at Alwintz and sought only how they might escape to Creutz. And since the brethren at Creutz saw that they were knit with love to the Brotherhood and earnestly desired to save their souls, although they were too weak to endure successfully at Alwintz, they could not withhold their aid, and helped them as much as possible.

Now it is true that a number had already fallen away, as mentioned above, but the majority had not yet become Catholic. The priest, becoming impatient, threatened to quarter soldiers

in the homes of those who still held out faithful. Mertl Roth held him off and told him to have patience, that he would be able to accomplish everything by good words with the people, so that no soldiers would be necessary.

But the Jesuit began nevertheless to use force in earnest. He was given soldiers by the authorities, a corporal and four or five privates, whom he quartered in the houses, and to whom the people had to furnish food and drink. And when the Sundays and holidays came they drove the people with force and blows to the Catholic Church. This continued for about a half year or more.

And again the Jesuit wrote to the governor of Hermannstadt that he should send back the people who had fled from Alwintz to Creutz.

Again those who had fled were returned by force. In consequence of the oppression more and more of the people fell away to Catholicism.

Since he had already won so many, the Jesuit now attacked the rest so much the harder. The soldiers dealt tyrannically and unmercifully with them. The poor women were handled roughly, especially Annele Wipf, and Judith Stahl. As a result of this inhuman treatment all were frightened, and fell away from the faith, so that of the entire congregation at Alwintz, only three were left who did not promise to become Catholic. And these three were Joseph Kuhr, Johannes Stahl, and Lorenz Tschetterle, all of whom were not at Alwintz at that time.

But the Lord who knoweth the hearts, saw that these brethren had faltered and fallen out of great weakness. And since they were of a sincere and pure heart, he helped them to rise again. For the hand of God was upon them, and their own heart and conscience troubled them because they had denied God and His truth out of fear of men. For this reason, as soon as they had opportunity, they did not remain in Alwintz but fled again to the Brotherhood at Creutz.

And since they bewailed their weakness, and humbled themselves, confessing their sin before God and the Brotherhood, and plead for forgiveness and pledged themselves to suffer evil and good with the Brotherhood by God's help, the Brotherhood had patience with them, and called on the name of the Lord in

their behalf. So the Brotherhood received them again, both them and their children.

Persecution at Creutz

Now when the Jesuit saw that the Brotherhood at Creutz was such a hindrance that he could not complete his program, he decided to go to Creutz and attack the congregation there with tyrannical persecution and force the Catholic faith on them. Accordingly he rode to Hermannstadt, where the governor gave him one of the privy councillors who went with him to Creutz. He also took the son of the apostate Mertl Roth with him. When they came to Creutz they first went to the magistrate. The privy councillor handed him the order of the governor that they should support the Jesuit in all his endeavors and further his work.

The next day the Jesuit came personally with the privy councillor and the village magistrate to the Bruderhof, accompanied by horsemen and villagers. The Jesuit preceded, the others followed. Then he searched all the rooms, closets, and garrets, and wherever he found one of the Alwintzers he pointed him out, whereupon the horseman and magistrate seized him. When he had gathered them all together they were driven to the house of the magistrate by the horsemen and villagers, while the peasants saw to it that none escaped on the way.

Then the entire congregation was summoned to the Bruderhof. The privy councillor from Hermannstadt said that he had a decree to deliver to the entire congregation. While everyone listened quietly he said, among other things, that it was the strict command of the Governor of Hermannstadt that in the morning at 10 o'clock all should hear this priest. The Jesuit added, "Tomorrow and the next day, and continually," pointing to himself at the same time, and saying, "Yes, I, I am the one whom you must hear."

The Brethren refused briefly and crisply, and said they would not take a step to please this false prophet, still less would they listen to his false teaching, for they well knew the cleverness and treachery of the papal Church together with its false teaching. They thanked God that he had delivered them and led them out from such darkness and miserable error. For this reason, the Jesuit need not suppose that they would follow him or accept the papal religion. They had decided by the help of

God, to suffer everything, yea, death, rather than to return to such error and false faith. Much more was said than is written here, since each brother testified to the truth boldly to their faces, and even some of the sisters did not remain quiet. The Jesuit walked back and forth, shut his eyes, and knew of nothing else to say than this: "Wait, just wait, I shall teach you." And with that he with his company withdrew.

He saw at once that he would not be able to accomplish anything with ease, wherefore he did not remain there long but rode away at once to Hermannstadt, where he commanded the authorities to seize Johannes Stahl, and described his form and appearance—they would find him as a man of 50 years, small in body, swarthy and with curly hair.

Johannes Stahl was soon thereafter seized and imprisoned. Those who had fled were returned to Alwintz in August, 1766.

After this, these poor brethren with their children were taken back to Alwintz two or three times more. For, although Delpini took the poor children at once to his house, clothed and provided for them (for they had come into a very pitiful condition in these troublous times), and also had them baptized in the Catholic faith, the brethren and sisters of Alwintz would not stay there, but ran away to the Brotherhood at Creutz as soon as they could escape. When the Brotherhood there fled from Transylvania to Wallachia in 1767, they went with them. But of this more will be related later.

Good Counsel from an Apostate

The two brethren Johannes Stahl and Lorenz Tschetterle lay in prison in the Castle at Alwintz until the month of October. When the Jesuit saw that they could not be moved but rather clung close to their faith, he sent both to Clausenburg with the intention of having them together with Joseph Kuhr banished from the land.

When the two brethren were being led away, the apostate brother Jacob Stutz came to them and walked with them a short distance on the way, comforting them and telling them to be faithful, for when one falls away and denies the truth he has no peace in his soul but constantly experiences the gnawing worm of an accusing conscience, just as he was experiencing. Hence they should be strong; the Lord would support them and give them strength and power.

Although this comfort came from an apostate it was nevertheless very welcome support for the brethren, who were in great distress and sorrow after the flesh, as one might well imagine their state of mind, especially that of Johannes Stahl who had to leave his wife and four children, not knowing whether he should ever see them again. But, though they were forsaken by all men, God strengthened them so that they did not despair nor lose heart in all their tribulation.

Thus has been told the story, briefly but accurately and thoroughly, of the decline and end of the Brotherhood at Alwintz in Transylvania, how it was totally destroyed and rooted out, for as related above the great majority became Catholic. The brethren Joseph and Johannes were banished from the land on pain of death. A few, by the providence of God, escaped with the Brotherhood at Creutz out of the land, namely sixteen persons, and three persons came from Transylvania to the Brotherhood in Russia in the year 1782.

* * * * *

IV.

The Renewal of the Brotherhood and Flight to Wallachia

In the year 1752 there had arisen in the Catholic Archduchy of Carinthia in Austria a religious awakening, due to the spread of the writings of Martin Luther, Johann Arndt, Joseph Schaidberger, and others. A large number of people decided to become Lutherans. They were at once imprisoned and threatened with severe punishment. Those who remained true to their convictions were deported to Transylvania, with the loss of all their possessions. Transylvania, although likewise under the Austrian Crown, tolerated the Lutheran Confession. Two hundred and seventy persons were forcibly deported to Transylvania. Upon their arrival there they were required by the authorities to swear allegiance to the Empress Maria Theresa, so that she might be assured of their further loyalty, whereupon they were promised that "she will be further gracious to you and permit you to build at her own expense your homes, and will give you in addition lands, meadows, and other necessaries". Numbers of them however were of the opinion that Christ had forbidden the swearing of oaths, so they refused to swear although they held to the ortho-

dox Augsburg Confession (Lutheran) in all other respects.

They soon learned that the Lutheran Church in Transylvania did not measure up to their conception of a true church. They were especially displeased with the lack of true discipline on account of which open, grievous sinners were not excluded from the church. Although they were seriously disappointed in these respects, they continued to attend the Lutheran Church during the first winter, and had their children baptized in this faith.

Since they had not sworn the required oath of allegiance they failed to receive any land, and because of this were compelled to earn a precarious living by the work of their hands as day-laborers. Two of them found work at Alwintz where they became acquainted with the Hutterian Brotherhood and its faith and life at that place. It is true that the Brotherhood at Alwintz had already departed in several points from the old confession of the Brotherhood, but the exiles from Carinthia secured the old writings of the Brethren and read them with increasing interest and approval. At this time a persecution set in to force them to join the Lutheran Church, in the course of which they were all scattered throughout various districts by the police so that they could no longer meet together. Several of them were imprisoned. However the man who was the moving force behind this persecution died within ten days after the beginning of the effort to scatter them.

One of the exiles, Hans Kleinsasser, had settled in the village of Creutz. In the year 1761 several other families moved to this village with the knowledge and consent of the magistrate. The villagers also welcomed the newcomers since they had been faithful workers for them. Other families came and in the following year a Hutterian congregation was established by these Carinthian Lutheran exiles, according to the old discipline of the Hutterian Brotherhood. Hans Kleinsasser, who had been ordained by the laying on of hands by the elders at Alwintz (Martin Roth and Joseph Kuhr) was chosen as elder, Joseph Mueller as steward of temporal needs, and George Waldner as schoolmaster. Friends from other localities moved to Creutz and joined the new congregation. Several persons came from the congregation at Alwintz, especially several widows and children. These latter were sent back to Alwintz several times by force as a result of the machinations of the Jesuit Delpini, but each time returned to the congregation at Creutz, as we have seen.

"Every day," says the chronicler Johannes Waldner, "the congregation assembled unitedly for prayer and the praise of God If there was evil or wrong found among them, the guilty person was earnestly reproved. The Lord blessed his little flock with material goods also, although they were not able to cultivate or harvest anything, but earned their bread as laborers and by spinning and weaving."

On the 10th of August the Jesuit Delpini succeeded in having the congregation, which numbered 46 members, driven out with great tyranny and brutality, and scattered throughout the surrounding villages. But in eight days they were all back in Creutz. And now the Jesuit decided to adopt the same measures against them as were used in Hungary and Alwintz. The same chronicler writes further concerning this:

> Truly it is not through the mercy of the wolves that sheep are allowed to live; likewise it was not in the power of the Jesuit to deal with the Lord's lambs according to the tyrannical purpose of his heart. For the Lord God restrained his endeavors and did not permit them to succeed. The authorities in Hermannstadt (capital of Transylvania) did not wish to authorize such brutality without the imperial order. So the godless Delpini went to Vienna to the Empress. For this reason the undertaking was postponed until the next year. But after he had secured full authority and power to exterminate the Anabaptists he came again to Hermannstadt in August. And when he displayed his imperial authorization to the authorities they could no longer hinder him.

The chronicler Johannes Waldner continues further:

> At the same time in the providence of God the two dear brethren Joseph Kuhr and Johannes Stahl came to us. Almost the first words of Brother Andreas Wurz were, "Well, Brother Joseph, have you come to lead us out of the land?" Brother Joseph answered, "Yes, Brother Andreas, if it be the will of God." Then the two brethren related that in Moldavia and Wallachia (modern Roumania) there was plenty of room as well as freedom of religion, and that there the various Christian confessions were tolerated side by side; Greek Orthodox, Jews, and Armenians lived in the towns. No one would be disturbed or persecuted on account of his faith. The land was subject to the Turkish Emperor.[66] The two banished brethren had risked

their lives to return and report to the Brotherhood that there was toleration in the provinces named.

The Brotherhood had existed in the village of Creutz for six years. They lived there in the simplicity of Christ according to the life and discipline of the apostolic church, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, and maintained community of temporal goods and separation from the world as much as was possible. Excommunication was practiced against the wicked and disobedient, and strict training of children was maintained.

The Flight of the Brotherhood from Transylvania

On the third of October, 1767, at ten o'clock in the morning, the flight of the congregation took place. The brethren had prepared two wagons, one with two pair of oxen, and one with two teams of horses, and on these the most essential things were loaded. The leave-taking was pitiful to see, for the brethren and sisters, and even the grown youth of 14 and 15 years, each took his staff in his hand, a bundle on his back, and many a one carried his infant child on top of his pack. The little children of four and five years had to go on foot. So they departed in the name of God. The well-built brotherhood house and much household equipment was left behind unsold.

So we left Creutz, 67 souls (of whom 16 were from the old congregation at Alwintz), with heavy hearts at the thought of leaving behind the brethren and sisters who lay in prison at Repes and Hermannstadt, but the most of whom later succeeded in returning to the Brotherhood. No one asked them to halt, for the way was prepared by God.

The flight was carried out under the greatest difficulties. It was necessary to avoid attracting attention and for that reason a guide was necessary who would know every stick and stone of the way and could lead them over the least frequented roads.

Beyond Nuszbach on the seventh day of the journey, the wagons had to be taken through two villages on the main highway, but they feared they would not be able to pass through safely with all the people. So the guide sent his servant with the people. He led them to one side of the villages over the mountain and valley until they came again to the wagons on the highway. When we came to the Kronstadt heath, the guide would neither halt nor rest, but drove on without stop or stay,

and our people and wagons did not dare to lag behind for the guide feared that he might be halted. So we hastened that we might pass Kronstadt before daybreak. Hard as the journey by day across Kronstadt heath was, the night journey was much more trying. That night many a one experienced what had seemed impossible to him before, namely that one can sleep and walk at the same time.

Through untold dangers the Brotherhood, on the 10th of October, finally reached the high levels of the Carpathian mountain range which had to be crossed. Here they met a constable who told them he must report them to the authorities.

At this our anxiety and fear was increased many fold, since we expected nothing else but that we would now all be taken captive. But the elders addressed the people, saying that they should not be so faint-hearted, and despair at once of the help of God. If it should be the will of God that we should be captured, we should be ready to accept it in patience by the help of God. Of what value was this vain apathy and complaining? This they said and more. The same day the escort which had been ordered arrived and preparations were made to leave that night at once. But it was impossible to get over the mountains with the wagons so the most necessary things were loaded on the four horses. The four oxen were driven across unloaded. The empty wagons were left behind until such a time as the escort would have opportunity to bring them by way of the highway.

When everything was ready, just as the sun was setting, we started out again on the 13th of October. The escort took us on untrodden ways through the underbrush and wilderness, where they knew that we were safe and without danger, for they knew all the secret ways of the mountains. At many places we had to climb up on hands and feet. Everybody took care to follow closely so that he would not be left behind. At several places the loaded pack-horses were brought up only with great difficulty. So we struggled on during the entire night. Each one can best imagine for himself what a difficult and tedious journey that was, with bag and baggage and little ones on the back, to climb the high mountains with young and old and weak ones, and that at night. The border was at the very top of the mountain.

Having crossed the border we were safe. We travelled slower a distance on the yonder side of the mountain until daybreak. Then we halted at the side of a brook and had a season of united prayer and thanksgiving, and praised the Lord that he had led us out of the power and hand of the false prophet and soul-murderer, and helped us all mercifully over the high mountains, without a one of us being lost or harmed in any way.

The Jesuit Delpini had intended to take our children from us and put them into an orphanage. This he had arranged with the Empress Maria Theresa. Everything had been prepared in Trenschment outside of Hermannstadt; even the beds for our children were in readiness. But God had brought his plans to naught and so planned and arranged it that the snare which he had prepared for us was torn apart, and when he reached for us we had already fled the land. Praise God, who did not permit us to fall prey to their jaws. We have escaped with our lives as a bird escapes the snare of the hunter; the snare is broken and we are free. Our help is in the name of the Lord who made heaven and earth. (Psalm 124, 6-8.)

The Brotherhood in Wallachia. Migration to Russia.

The Brotherhood settled at Tschoregirle (German Kraehbach). Here, on account of the unhealthful location they had to endure much suffering from sickness. In the spring of 1769 the congregation moved to Paretschin a few hours distant. War had broken out between Russia and Turkey, and Wallachia was occupied by a Russian army. In these troublous times of war the Brotherhood was plundered of a large part of its household goods and clothing, not by the soldiery, but by plundering bands.

The Russian General Sametin, to whom they appealed in their need, manifested a friendly interest in them and advised them to emigrate to Russia. He gave them a wagon with a pair of oxen for the journey and supplied them with the necessary passport. On the 10th of April, 1770 they set out. In the province of Moldavia near the city of Hattin they met the Russian Field Marshal Count Romanzov and entered into a contract with him through which they received permission to settle on one of his Manors at Wischenka, on the River Desna in the province Tscherinogov, not far from Gluchow in Northern Ukraine. Freedom of religion was guaranteed to them, and a loan for the establishment of a Bruderhof was promised. In addition the Count gave

them money for the journey. On the 1st of August, 1770, they reached Wischenka. Here the Brotherhood soon attained a position of considerable prosperity. Pottery, weaving, and metal-working were highly developed.

> In the year 1771, on July 20, we were again gathered together under one roof and at one table, and on the 24th of July the first preaching service was held in the newly built house. In the year 1778 the primary and advanced schools were built. On the 21st of December, 1772, all the prisoners in Transylvania were released on command of the authorities. Matthias Hofer had lain in prison at Hermannstadt for 16 years. Several others had been in prison for five years. On the 26th of January, 1773, they arrived in Wischenka and were received with great joy by the Brotherhood. The returning prisoners brought the *Large Brotherhood-Chronicle* with them ("Grosse Gemein-Geschichtbuch"), which, together with other books, they had been able to secure at Alwintz through the special providence of God.

Connections of the Brotherhood with Their Friends in Hungary and Carinthia

In the year 1780 the news began to drift in through various persons who had come from Germany (Austria) to Russia, that in the German Empire great changes were taking place since the Empress Maria Theresa had died and her son, Joseph II, was crowned Emperor, especially that the new Emperor had promised religious liberty to all faiths.

Thereupon it was decided to send two brethren to Levar and Sabatisch in Hungary, as well as to Carinthia. These brethren visited the apostate brethren in Levar. To the latter it seemed almost unbelievable that a Hutterian Brotherhood still existed.[67] From here the two traveled to Carinthia to visit their friends and relatives. "Here they were received with great joy but were not able to accomplish their desires. For when they heard that we do not baptize the young children but only adults, it seemed altogether too remarkable and strange to them, for to this day the Anabaptists are greatly hated and in particular the common man supposes that there are no more awful heretics in the world than they. For this reason their nearest and dearest friends withdrew from all fellowship with them."

The two brethren retraced their steps to Levar, where they were at once expelled by a Jesuit. During their absence a movement had been started in both Levar and Sabatisch. So the brethren did not dare to go to Sabatisch. But Jacob Walter at Sabatisch sent several books, two Hutterian coats, two pairs of Hutterian breeches, and two pairs of Hutterian shoes to them at Pressburg, "so that the Brotherhood in Russia and their children might see and know the manner of clothes which our forefathers had been accustomed to wearing". After this brethren were repeatedly sent from Wischenka to Hungary, but their efforts were fruitless.

In the summer of the year 1782 a letter came from Jacob Walter at Sabatisch, dated June 22, in which it was reported that many in Sabatisch and Levar had again confessed their old faith. He plead with the brethren by the mercy of God to come to their aid and counsel as much as possible. Joseph Mueller and Christian Hofer at once departed for Hungary but were able to accomplish nothing. Before the two arrived at Levar and Sabatisch a persecution had arisen. Those who had declared that they wished to return to their old faith discovered that the Edict of Toleration of the Emperor included only the Papal, Lutheran, Calvinistic and Greek Orthodox religion. Emperor Joseph granted an audience to four men of Sabatisch who had been imprisoned but refused to grant them toleration. Some time later Jacob Walter escaped to Russia. He traveled by way of Gnadenfrei where he was granted a pass by Count Zinzendorf. Within the next few years a total of about 55 persons escaped from Levar and Sabatisch to Russia. Many who had undertaken the flight to Russia were caught on the way and returned.

An Audience Granted by the Emperor

As mentioned above, the delegates, Joseph Mueller and Christian Hofer were not able to attain their purpose. In fact they could not get farther than Vienna. After lengthy counsel in Vienna they agreed that since it was impossible to accomplish anything with the people at Sabatisch, they would endeavor to do something on behalf of the inheritance of their people in their native land (they were natives of Carinthia who had emigrated to Transylvania where they had joined the Brotherhood), since they had the necessary documents with them. So they went to the Russian consulate where they announced themselves and their

mission. The clerks in the consulate aided them in the preparation of a petition which the brethren handed to the Emperor Joseph.

As the brethren returned to the imperial palace after four days to inquire about the matter, by chance it happened that the Emperor was just descending from an upper room. As he saw brother Christian standing there he called, "Come in." Christian went with him into a room, where they were alone together, and conversed for about a half hour. First the Emperor asked him what he wanted. The brother replied that he had sent him a petition and did not know whether it had reached him or not. The Emperor asked whence they came, whether they were not of those folk in Hungary. The brother replied that according to religion they were, but that they were natives of Carinthia, and were of the number who had been forced to migrate to Transylvania in 1755. The Emperor replied, "I know, I know."

The brother Christian thereupon begged the Emperor most humbly that he would permit them to secure their inheritance which they had left behind them. The Emperor replied, "Come back to your fatherland to your house and home and you shall have everything again." The brother said, "They will not tolerate us but continually persecute us." The Emperor said with earnest words, "Who persecutes? Who persecutes? No one persecutes now."

Then the brother said, "Just this summer in Hungary six men lay more than a month in prison for their faith's sake." Then the Emperor was silent for a time and finally said, "Well, what of it? That is but a small thing. One must adopt some religion, Catholic, Lutheran, Calvinistic, or Greek. The brother replied, "We cannot be convinced in our heart of any teaching differing from that which Christ the Lord and his apostles themselves gave, namely that one should abide in the pure doctrine and follow him and live a pious Christian life."

Thereupon the Emperor asked many questions. What we are named? How it went with us in Transylvania? Whether we were allowed to have property? Whether we had been given land? Whether the priest who had persecuted us in Transylvania was not called Delpini? How we fared in the persecution? How we came into Wallachia? And where we lived

there? Whether it was a good land? How we fared there? Why we had gone into Russia? Where we live there at present? Whether the Count had given us enough land? Whether our houses were of stone or wood? Whether we had a priest? And whether he was married?

All these questions Brother Christian answered faithfully according to the truth, and the Emperor listened very attentively to him. Then Christian pleaded once more reasonably for the property which we had had to leave behind. The Emperor did not reply with yes or no, but asked how we were able to get out of Russia. When brother Christian told him that we had secured a passport from our Count to visit our friends in Austria, he permitted him to leave. The Emperor himself accompanied him to the door.

Some years later word was received from Hermannstadt, that the abandoned property of the Brotherhood which amounted to 2151 Gulden had had to be sent in haste to Vienna, but that where it remained there no one was able to discover. At least nothing of it ever came to the Brotherhood.

A Visit by a Moravian from Germany in Levar

In the year 1783 the former Hutterian Congregation in Levar was visited by a delegate from the Moravian Church at Herrnhut. The Moravian had received word of the persecution in Hungary through Jacob Walter, whereupon the directorate of the Moravians in Saxony had delegated the former schoolmaster Czolsch to visit the Hutterians in Hungary who had been converted by the Jesuits. An abstract of his report follows here.[68]

When he came to the Bruderhof he went to the pottery and was led at his request by the master potter to the warehouse, where he wished to speak to him privately. Czolsch relates the story of his visit as follows:

When I was alone with him, I asked him whether he knew one by the name of Jacob Walter. He replied, "Why should I not know him since he is my brother in the flesh?" I told him that I had learned to know him in Saxony when he was on his flight to Russia. At that time the sad condition in which he and they were living had affected me very much, etc. He said that they now had peace, and all trouble was over since they had all become Catholic and promised under oath to remain Catholic, and to ever confess that they had all accepted this religion

of their own free will and not by force. I asked whether they would not have done better to adopt the Augsburg Confession of the Lutheran Church. He replied quite indifferently that it would go ill with him who would now suggest such a change.

He said that I had risked a good deal to come to them under the present circumstances. They had promised, if they suspected any one, to disclose him to one another and report him, and I had great cause to beware that I should not come into misfortune in this place. If I should be discovered, I would be imprisoned and probably never be able to regain my liberty. I asked him whether they had been able to keep their books. Answer—No, they had handed them all over to the priests and disclosed all their secret hiding places according to their promise. More than two wagon loads of books had been carted to Pressburg. Even here in his own house there had been several hidden of whch he knew nothing. These had also been discovered and turned over.

I asked him whether I would find conditions different in St. Johann or Sabatisch, or whether it would be the same. Answer: Not different than here. By this time it was no longer quiet where we were: first one and then another came up and saw and listened to what was going on. He warned me again as I left of a threatening possible misfortune. I cannot describe how sad I felt to have found this folk in such a situation and to have to leave them again as they were.

The Brotherhood in Reditschawa and on the Molotschna River

The sons of Count Romanzov attempted to make serfs of the Brethren but the Emperor Alexander I decreed by a ukase of May 22, 1801, that they might settle on crown land and enjoy the same rights and privileges as were enjoyed by the Mennonites who had immigrated from Prussia. In the year 1802 therefore they moved to Reditschawa on the Desna, 15 versts from Wischenka, after they had lived 32 years at Wischenka. In the new home a primary and advanced school was built, also a preaching room and workshops. The workshops included shops for weaving, pottery, tailoring, shoemaking, turning, hatting, and tanning. In addition there were built a large water-mill as well as a windmill. Here it became evident after a time that inner decay had set in. The enemy, says the chronicler, sowed tares among the wheat. In addition, disunity developed among the ministers. In

the year 1819 community of goods was abandoned. The Brotherhood became poverty-stricken. "Ruin in spiritual and temporal things threatened," says the chronicle. At the request of the Brethren, the Mennonite Johann Cornies, who had oversight over the Mennonite colonies, assumed oversight over them. He helped them to secure good land on the Molotschna. In the year 1842 the entire colony, 78 families, moved to the Molotschna and established the village of Huttertal. In the year 1853 a second village Johannesruh was founded. In 1857 two other villages were established in the same Gouvernement, namely Hutterdorf, and Neu-Huttertal. Here the Brotherhood again attained a degree of prosperity. A sum of 15,000 rubles which had been loaned them by the Russian government was soon repaid.

In the spring of the year 1857, 33 families from Huttertal made an attempt to reestablish community of goods, but the attempt failed. In the year 1859 Elder Michael Waldner with a number of families set up a Bruderhof with community of goods. Darius Walter also established a Bruderhof. Thus there were two communistic Hutterian Bruderhofs on the Molotschna.

The Brethren in America

In the years 1873-1879 all the congegations of the Hutterian Brethren emigrated to the United States because of the withdrawal by the Russian government of the previous absolute freedom from military or government service. They settled in the Territory of Dakota in what is the modern state of South Dakota. The first party of 250 people, some thirty-five or forty families, settled in two Bruderhofs not far north of the Nebraska border on the Missouri and the James, namely Bon Homme and Wolf Creek. In 1877, 17 additional families came, establishing a Bruderhof at Elm Spring. Another group came in 1879. Those who had practiced community of goods in Russia continued the same order in Dakota. A few others adopted this policy anew in Dakota. The others who had not gone back to the communistic system in Russia continued the system of private ownership in Dakota. The proportion of the two types was about half and half. As the population of the various Bruderhofs increased, more land was secured and new Bruderhofs established until the total number was 17.

During the World War the Hutterian Brethren were subject to peculiarly vicious attacks by overzealous local patriotic officials

for their firm maintenance of their four-century-old position on non-resistance. The only conscientious objectors to die as a result of persecution in the camps during the war were two young men from a Hutterian Bruderhof, Joseph and Michael Hofer. As a result of their sufferings, all but five (namely 12) of the Bruderhofs migrated to Manitoba and Alberta, where they had been promised complete freedom from military service by the Canadian government.

About the middle of the year 1926 the total number of souls in the Hutterian Brotherhood of the communistic type, the original type, numbered 3,015. These were scattered over 29 Bruderhofs or congregations. An approximately equal number were to be found in the congregations in South Dakota, North Dakota, Saskatchewan, and California, that did not maintain communism. A few of the latter congregations have united with Mennonite groups.

There is no central organization for the 29 Bruderhofs. Each is governed by its own organization, and the various organizations may and do differ in minor practices and policies. In the fundamental ancestral principles however they maintain approximate uniformity.

Such is the story of the Hutterian Brethren, a story of unparalleled martyrdom and loyalty for four hundred years.

NOTES

65. Three rods "were broken on him". (Beck, *Geschichtsbuecher*, p. 616.)

66. Flight into Turkish territory presented, humanly speaking, the only possibility for preserving the Hutterian Brotherhood at this time.

67. At Levar and Sabatisch (Szobotiste) in modern Czechoslovakia the descendants of those who were forced to accept the Roman Catholic creed still live in some of the former Bruderhof buildings. They are known by the name "Habaner". Cf. Friedmann, R.; *Die Habaner in der Slowakei*, Wien, 1927.

68. *Zeitschrift fuer Bruedergeschichte*, Vol. IV, Herrnhut, 1910, pp. 216-220.

(To be Concluded)